00029419

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

Digitized with financial assistance from

on 10 July, 2018

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS:

ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[*Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the "Statesman and Friend of India."*]

By Robert Knight.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

PUBLISHED AT
THE "STATESMAN" OFFICE,
3, Chowringhee, Calcutta.

1893.

329.95 4
Kni/Ind
29419

CALCUTTA :
PRINTED AT THE "STATESMAN" STEAM PRESS, 3, CHOWRINGHEE.

therefore, that their criticism should be, on the whole, moderate and constructive, and that while joining issue with the executive officials or the heads of departments, they should leave the Government free to decide between the two. No good is likely to accrue from mixing up the Government with its officials. If the Government is always a tool in the hands of its officials; if the officials are all so bad as they are sometimes painted; then there is no hope, no chance, of improvement. A general smash up of the machinery must follow. Are the critics prepared to carry on the administration themselves? If not, they will doubtless see the risk of weakening the hold of Government by a wanton abuse of their power of check and control.

On the other hand, if this outside controlling agency has its duty, so has the governing agency. If the officials want forbearance on the part of their critics, they must themselves show conciliation and the power to unbend. This is a great *power*, the power of unbending, if they will see it. They must give up the old attitude of disdain, and try to replace it gradually by a habit of accommodation, a willingness to learn and to unlearn. The rigidity of the old habit—a second nature with the Anglo-Saxon abroad—must relax in proportion to the rise of Western ideas in the country. It is this new leaven that makes the subjects impatient of rough usage, sensitive under restraint, and eager to find fault with their betters. Is there anything unduly derogatory to your dignity in this

assertion of self-respect on the part of English-educated Indians?—anything of an insult to your own self-respect? On the contrary, it is the highest compliment that governors could claim. Let the officials recognize this new force by treating as their equals those educated representatives of the people, who are worthy of such treatment. If they expect public criticism of their measures to be constructive, let them take the critics into confidence, and give them an insight into the working of the Administration. This was the objective the earlier statesmen had in view. And this has been the policy of their successors generally. To draw upon the educated intelligence of the people, in the management of their own affairs, and so far to lighten the burden on the foreign agency and at the same time to make its rule more acceptable—this has been the principle underlying British policy, more especially since the passing of India to the Crown. Have the executive duly appreciated this beneficent policy? The older paternal attitude may have had its merits; but it has served its purpose, and must now be put upon the shelf of past history so far as the educated classes have to be dealt with. That attitude is incompatible with the genius of England, with its system of education and administration. What was accepted in the older days as paternal guidance is now resented as step-motherly intermeddling. The *Mabap* of old, mother and father rolled into one, and venerated with the dual homage lavished on the cow, has now come to be stigmatised as the male-spinster in office, to be teased and laughed at. It is useless for

320.954
Som/Som
29419.

the latter, and worse than useless, to sit wringing his hands at what he thinks to be the ingratitude of the younger generation in refusing to be snubbed and cajoled by turn; to be treated as children incapable of growing to man's estate. Why stigmatise as reckless the child's attempt to walk, now that it has learnt to stand on its legs, may be with the crutch of a wise concession? Why denounce as disloyal the attempts of a boy who has begun to run about and stretch his limbs by way of preparation for a trial of strength worthy of his manhood, fostered by yourself? If there is so much of discontent and 'sedition' in the country, side by side with the spread of education; if no educated native is free from this contagion; what hope is there for the permanence of a foreign rule?—what justification for the presence of foreigners in India? Logically, and in the light of human experience, the British ought to be proud of the change they have been witnessing. Even if this change required a further concession, they ought to be willing to make it, provided the general interests do not suffer thereby. It is time the average official learnt to recognize the various forces that are coming into play, and of which he himself is partly the author. Personally as well as in his official capacity must the Englishman broaden the basis of his sympathy with the educated Indian, quicken his pace with him wherever he can; he must unbend, must stoop to conquer; or, having conquered, to rule. His natural stolidity is not without its uses; but it ill compares with the quickness of other ruling races; and the oriental, steeped in western

radicalism, is apt to make too much of this comparison. Let Englishmen and Englishwomen in India be fair and courteous towards the educated native everywhere—from the railway carriage to the Viceregal Durbar. Let them behave as Christian exemplars, at any rate in the minor details of life. Are they above the Queen Empress and her family in this respect? Surely, that example ought to suffice for the winning of hearts and the cooling of heads. May it be given to these representatives of a foreign Power to understand that "loyalty" does not mean the selfish humouring of their own sweet will, but disinterested attachment to the Crown and the nation they have come out to serve and to represent! There is no other "loyalty", in the political sense, to which an educated intellect or a cultured conscience could reconcile itself.

To return to the main theme, is a feeling of unrest coming over India? As regards the towns and the cities, and more or less as regards the educated classes and those that come in contact with them, the question must be answered in the affirmative. To the extent indicated, there is some new spirit abroad, call it unrest or activity, or anything else you like. But there is nothing in it to cause alarm or even surprise. Is this change in the spirit of Young India's dream unexpected? We must not shut our eyes to sixty years of western education, ushering in freedom of discussion, with the newspaper press for its outward symbol, scattering light and darkness alike, aided by railway, telegraph

and post. Was not the result fully anticipated by those who fought for and secured to India the benefits of modern education? Why, then, the present surprise? If the surprise is feigned, the sooner we cease playing with edged tools, the better. Let us also remember that the press in India, with their allies, have hitherto done much more of the talking than of the thinking. Strange as it may sound, the thinking stage has yet to be reached through this talking and writing stage. The majority of Indian writers have yet to learn history. They know but little of the outside world, even of a next-door neighbour like Egypt. But this limited knowledge suffices to tell them that England is their good providence. It is this knowledge, really, that accounts for most of the extravagance marking the utterances of the press and of the platform orator. Why should the official mind make itself uneasy over the inevitable? Of the two evils, of popular unrest and official distrust, the latter is decidedly worse; it marks a deterioration of the stuff of which statesmen are made. As proof of this may be instanced the question, half sneeringly asked by a friendly official, "If your people do not want us, why don't they turn us out of India?" Happily, the Indians know better. Supposing the English took it into their heads to withdraw from India in favour of a Home Rule party, they would very likely find a telegram waiting for them at Aden, imploring them to return by the same steamer. A week's time would be long enough for the most sanguine among our politicians to see

that governing a country, governing their own country, is not half so easy a task as passing resolutions or recording votes. Let us, therefore, dismiss the suspicion, if any exits, that conductors of the Indian press are preparing to assume the supreme conduct of affairs. These writers may sometimes do more harm than good by their one-sided activity; but are we satisfied that the absence of such activity would not lead, might not have led, to more undesirable results? The press in India compare favourably, on the whole, with their prototype elsewhere; and as is known, the worse offenders among them borrow their tactics from those who are bound to set them a better example. Besides, writers in the press do not always mean half of what they say; nor is their opinion invariably the opinion of the public at large.

Much the same view may be taken of our political bodies, with the Congress at their head. The Congress does not wish to usurp the reins of government; it is content with ventilating grievances and suggesting remedies. Whatever the smaller adherents of this movement may say or do, its responsible leaders know their place and their principal function. They know that they are in charge of a ploughing machine which, if wisely used, may clear the field of Indian Administration, and make it fit hereafter for sowing the seed of true political progress. They know how uneven the soil is, and how ungrateful. Why

not let them plough, so long as they vary the initial process according to the varying nature of the soil? If all goes well, the next generation may do the sowing. The reaping of the harvest must be left to another generation. May we not trust to our political plough-boys, the product of English education, avoiding to sow the wind? They are sufficiently wise to know what the nation would have to reap therefrom. If the official class were equally wise, they might yet see that the best way for them to curse the Congress is to bless it; the easiest way of removing this thorn from the side of the Administration is to accept it as one of its own ribs. It would then cease to trouble, and there would be one cause the less of the unrest that haunts their waking hours. A word of warning may seem to be called for, in this place, for the extreme section of the Congress party, or rather, for those impossible little politicians who air their crudities in the name of the Congress. What has been submitted above, to responsible Indians in the enjoyment of the right of qualified control, applies, to a larger extent and with much greater force, to irresponsible public speakers and writers. These would do well, in creating difficulties for a foreign Government, to remember that the Government has serious difficulties of its own to contend with; especially the financial difficulty at home and the frontier difficulty abroad. That to go on hounding an agency, so situated, is to show as if the critics courted a change of rulers. If this is what our well-meaning malcontents want, they may be

sure they will find it a very bad exchange. A little knowledge of history, a brief acquaintance with the outer world, will show that the best of possible changes may prove perhaps worse than the worst we have yet reached under the British. Our only chance, therefore, is to use this foreign agency as our own, to make the most of it; correcting its mistakes, supplying its defects, helping it, with our more intimate knowledge of the conditions of life in the country, to a better frame of mind and a better mode of government. This is what the leaders of the Congress aim at: to improve the system of administration, not to abolish it. Any deviation from this fundamental principle is to be regretted. Much more to be regretted is the new tendency, observable here and there, for the Congress to degenerate into a caucus; or, to be more accurate, the attempts that seem to be made in some quarters to use the Congress as a caucus. Nothing could be more unfortunate for a country just awakening to a sense of freedom and independence. As against the Government, such a caucus would only intensify the spirit of bureaucracy that runs rampant, darken counsel, and make the task of governing a heterogeneous mass doubly difficult. As against the majority of educated or otherwise influential Indians, a caucus like this, if allowed to raise its head, would work even greater havoc. It would be another vested interest, added to the hundreds under which the people in general groan. With its sinister organization of boycoting and terrorism, it might become the most powerful

ngine for repressing the nascent spirit of inde-
endence which is the best result of liberal educa-
on, and which it is one of the principal objects of
he promoters of the Congress to foster and to pre-
erve from the grinding operation of the bureaucracy.
With some of our purblind ultra-radicals the ideal
of "patriotism" seems to have become as bleared as
he ideal of "loyalty" has become obscured with
elf-satisfied officials. Patriotism is not a blatant
lenunciation of everything that emanates from
thers, nor an equally blatant exaltation of the
mptiness of our own conceits. If the Congress had
ore consistent, self-denying, practical adherents
-men willing to improve as well as advance—it
ould find the majority of Englishmen ready, at
ast, to listen to it. It might find many an offi-
al working with it for the common good. The
-operation of liberal-minded officials, trained
the ways of the administration, and acquainted
ith the needs of the people, would be of value, not
nly in the mooting of practical questions, but also
working them up with the help of select com-
ittees entrusted with special inquiries all over the
untry, and in confronting official optimists and
ologists with the results of such inquiries. What an
mense scope there is for such constructive work
regard to the questions of poverty, the employ-
ent of natives in the subordinate branches of the
blic service, for which they are naturally much
tter fitted than foreigners; for work in ascertain-
g the grievances of the poor, as inflicted by bad
ws, or the bad working of good laws in the hands of

the Revenue, Forest, Salt, Abkari, and other departments !—for work in reference to sanitation and hygiene, and certain outer aspects of what is called the social question, but which has really a more direct bearing on the political progress of the country; and for the redress of other self-inflicted wrongs ! All this, however, means responsible *work*—study, comparison, verification—and the exercise of constant self-restraint.

And here ends our concern, for the present, with that popular unrest in India which is making the official mind so restless. It is not difficult to decide which is the more pitiable—the spirit of unrest coming over a section of the Indian community, drunk with the wine of European ideas, or the unsettling of the Anglo-Saxon mind that has learnt to smell a mutiny in unleavened bread or the daubing of trees. The people of India as a whole, seem to be equally indifferent to both—to the peevish unrest of their Anglicized brethren, and the morbid wakefulness of some of their Indianized rulers.

But how, then, are we to explain recent occurrences in India? What about the mysterious daubing of mango trees in Behar? Well, if this incident shows anything, it shows from what little causes the excited imagination may jump to large sweeping conclusions. This smearing of trees is by no means the first occurrence of its kind, though certainly the first to be taken so much notice of.

Who has not heard of villagers smearing trees, in order to avert a blight, or cutting holes into them for their gods to dwell in, or making certain uniform marks on or near them, in order to indicate the route to a new shrine? Such work needs sudden execution—mystery is its chief merit. The local authorities here did not notice it, because it was not worth noticing in the first instance. Nobody was caught doing it, because it was nobody's business to catch the victims of superstition. When the whole thing was noticed on an unusually extensive scale, it began to call for explanation. But there was no explanation forthcoming, as there was nothing to explain. The villagers became *mum*, finding the police to be serious. The seriousness was, perhaps, as much an after-thought, a thing put on, as was the air of mystery and silence on the other side. Once the incident was raised into a portent of political danger, and excitement rose to its height where all should have been calm indifference, it needed but little ingenuity to weave explanations and gloomy forecasts. Very much the same importance was given to the distribution of *chapátis* just before the outbreak of the sepoy revolt. That, too, was a mysterious occurrence, and could not but have caused the troubles it preceded. In fact, however, the Mutiny has never been traced to the *chapátis*. The latter were more likely distributed by some happy father, out of gratitude to his gods having heard his prayers for a son and heir. He was probably rich enough to distribute them in large quantities, and the balance was passed on

from village to village, till the origin of the *chapáti* became lost, and they went their way rejoicing a sacred *prasád*, that is food sent by the gods to thei followers, to be partaken of sparingly and passed on to believers still farther off. The distribution of bread and sweets is a common practice in India, and we sometimes hear of thousands of plates passing over the land to wherever the sender's relatives and caste people reside. Nor is it rare to see cart-loads of cooked food distributed by the Vaishnava Maharajas and other heads of religion among thei followers. Thus the *chapátis* had probably no more to do with the Mutiny than had the "Ferociou Dooly," immortalized by the M.P. knowing every thing about it all. And the moral of such incidents is, that if the people of India are superstitious some of its administrators are no less ready t lose their heads.

But how do we account for the riots that brok out recently in several parts of the country? Well these outbreaks had nothing of the political or th agrarian element in them, but arose solely out o religious fanaticism, though at a later stage thirst for plunder and rapine might have bee observed. The people are beginning to cherish keener apprehension of their religious rights an privileges. The newspaper press here and ther stimulate their zeal, and thus unconsciously hel to spread the contagion of race hatred. The situa tion has become more difficult for Governmen Hitherto, the Mahomedans had it much their ow way .The Hindus are now beginning to asse

themselves. Strong in number, but slow in action, they somehow feel they have not been well used by the authorities. Government are not, probably, so much to blame. The Mahomedans are easier to get on with; they are generally frank and open, and willing to suit action to word. If numerically weak in India, they have large and powerful connections elsewhere. Equal justice between the two—stern and swift and impartial, as Lord Lansdowne declared at Agra—is the only remedy. Such breaches of the peace, however, do not constitute a new danger. They have been the curse of India for centuries, and rather than threatening a political danger they seem to emphasize the necessity of outside control.

Deplorable as these religious disturbances are, it would be more deplorable still to father them on the British *regime*: a cruel misreading of history and statesmanship alike. "Divide and Rule" is no part of British Policy; no responsible British statesman would countenance a principle of government, at once so vicious and so widely at variance with the spirit of the age and the declared policy of the Crown and of Parliament. Those who conjure up such a misgiving and carry it up to the foot of the Throne, complaining that the employment of a Mahomedan Munshi by Her Majesty leads to an assumption of partiality, show themselves as children clutching at any excuse for their own childishness. There is something touchingly childlike in these ebullitions of temper—a pious expectation, perhaps, of obtain-

ing justice and a little over. But those who expec to win by a personal appeal of this kind forget tha as a private individual the Queen might pleas herself; that still, if she invites a Mahomedan t teach her the court language of India, she als sends for a Hindu to guide her in the mysteries o Indian art; that, in short, she goes upon qualifica- tion, not race, even in such matters. Her Majesty' interest in her Hindu subjects is no less keen tha that she evinces in the Mahomedans. Was it not on an appeal from a Hindu lady that the Queen started the project of medical aid and relief for the women of India, which has now spread like a net work over the continent, saving life and carrying health where disease and death were often the penalty of high position?

What has been said above does not, however, preclude the possibility of some of the minor executive, notably the Police, taking sides in these religious or race disputes, and even fomenting them. There are departments and de- partmental jacks that have to justify their existence, to secure continued employment. But once these are found making mischief, they will not be suffered to bring discredit on Government. It is for leaders of society to refuse to play into the hands of such official mischief-makers. They ought to help Gov- ernment in plucking these out of the Public Service, instead of holding Government responsible for their misconduct. It is a blunder thus to make Govern- ment a party to the offence committed by this or that irresponsible subordinate. Leaders of public

opinion would be much more usefully employed in restraining their own followers. But, at the same time, do not Government expect too much from these leaders in the way of restraint, after a disturbance has broken out? They must remember that Native gentlemen have not half the *prestige* of Europeans. They are not allowed to join a Volunteer Corps, nor are they all invested with the other civic rights that enable Europeans to act fearlessly on an emergency, to say nothing of the disability with which the Native always starts—that of belonging to one section of the community as against the others. Is it fair to call upon co-adjutors, so poorly equipped, to stand up for the maintenance of the general peace?

With questions in which the masses of India have but a remote or an indirect interest we need not concern ourselves much here. Of these there have been a number of late before Government, and the conclusions arrived at by the latter will have been taken generally as foregone conclusions, inevitable results of causes in themselves more or less inevitable.

Take, for one, the question of simultaneous examinations for the Civil Service, which has excited keen insterest among the educated classes. That there are very serious practical difficulties in holding the same examination at the same time in England and in India, cannot be denied. That such a reform may lead to similar difficulties with other parts of the Empire, may hold

equally good as an argument. But that these difficulties are insurmountable, it is not so easy to see. With their own standard and their own tests, English candidates have no fear of being swamped. Then, there is the necessity of fulfilling a solemn pledge—a matter of paramount importance. So far as to theory. What do we find in practice? We find the entire Liberal Cabinet, including Lord Ripon, opposed to the proposal, on the ground principally, that so long as the British have to maintain a certain Military hold over India, they must maintain a proportionate hold over the administration on the Civil side too. There is no mistake about this unanimous verdict, shared in by Conservative statesmen. Even as it is, the British Government are casting about for some means of fixing a minimum for native candidates, a low limit in number beyond which they could not be admitted in spite of successful competition. What, then, becomes of your theory of "free and open competition"?—oh ye logical rulers! Smuggling a minimum limit in the same breath with parading a free competition, open to all Her Majesty's subjects! But the *ukase* has gone forth, and what remains for the aggrieved is to see if they could lead a side attack, less precarious and more certain of result. How would it do to establish a Civil Service Institute in India, with two or three of the best qualified Englishmen available, at the head and a staff of equally competent Indian teachers? It would be a saving in time and money, and minimize the risks to which every Indian student

is more or less exposed in London, although it could not counteract the threatened laying down of a limit in number. Let the boy be trained in India, and be sent to London for the final examination, to remain there for a year or so after his pass. Among the other advantages of such an arrangement there is the one of really clever boys getting a chance. At present, it is only those who have money to spend that can afford the luxury of a five years stay in a foreign land, without much concern as to consequences. Under the proposed scheme a middle class boy, or even a poor boy, could have a trial and could repay the expenses of a short stay in England. Many more [illegible]arents, besides, would be willing to part with [illegible]eir sons, for a short period, with much less expense [illegible]ur and much more certainty of success, and [illegible] a minimum of the risks inseparable from [illegible]tful associations during a prolonged stay [illegible]ad, at a time of life least likely to resist [illegible]umbing to these associations.

But, after all, is not this [illegible] for entrance into the Covenanted Civil Service [illegible]re sentimental than otherwise? What signi- [illegible] half a dozen more Indians getting in [illegible]iodically? What is wanted is a fair, honest [illegible]mpetition between Europeans and Natives for [illegible] branches of the Public Service—Engineer- [illegible]g, Medical, Forest, Post, Telegraph, Police, [illegible]bkari, Railway and so on. Are the sons of the [illegible]l provided for in these departments in anything [illegible]e reasonable proportion, with anything like the

interests of India in view, or the efficiency and popularity of the Service? Is employment under these heads always guided by principles of justice and fairplay? The open, unblushing partiality shown to outsiders constitutes a danger to the safety of the State, and detracts largely both from the efficiency and the popularity of some of the departments of the State. But here, too, the State needs co-operation from representatives of the people. These must aid their efforts towards the spread of scientific, technical and industrial education, so as not only to train up a generation of useful public officers, but also to develop the resources of the country. With such united efforts, the reproach, that Native students are wanting in practical business capacity, and the advocates of their claims in genuine public spirit, would also be removed. Surely, the classes that owe their wealth and influence to British supremacy can afford to part with a tithe of these, as thanks-offering for that beneficent agency, and as an initial help to those whose interests they have so much at heart. Where are our wealthy professional men, our merchant princes and zemindars?

Or, take the question of Poverty. This is among the pressing problems of the day. Why not face it, and be done? Is India growing poorer under the British Rule? The question, thus put, is rather misleading. But there is no other way, equally effective, in which to put it. It is an extremely difficult question, and

will hardly ever be answered fully in the affirmative or the negative. But still, an honest attempt ought to be made to face it. On the official side, it must be admitted that the standard of living tends to rise everywhere, excepting in those remote corners still unpenetrated by the smell of kerosine oil. It may also be admitted that the middle class of our day is almost a new class, a creation of the British—our lawyers, engineers, doctors, and other professionals. These make a wealthy and influential class by themselves, especially the lawyers. To them we must add the new race of cotton growers and workers in the fabric, as also the numbers absorbed by Government Service. As a set off, [redacted] must admit that the hereditary class as a whole, [redacted]*t perhaps in Bengal*, has had a tendency [redacted]rds impoverishment; while what are called the [redacted]*r classes* may be said to be stationary. For, [redacted]gh their wages or other earnings may have [redacted]en during the last fifty years, their wants also [redacted]ve risen or grown in number. On the whole, [redacted]erefore, there seems to have been a redistribution [redacted] wealth, so far, more than a depletion. But here [redacted]mes in an economic factor which unsettles the [redacted]hole calculation. The annual drain of wealth from [redacted]he country is appalling. It creates an emptiness [redacted]hich the fattest surplus possible to India cannot [redacted]ll. To say that the drain is inevitable, is an extenation, not a justification of the evil. It certainly [redacted]nnot lead to a remedy. And it is a remedy, *some* [redacted]emedy, that is wanted. But, it is asked, does it rest

with Government alone to find this remedy? Is the drain of wealth, in the shape of salaries, pensions, interest and other charges, the only cause of the poverty of India? Such a question appears to be beside the mark. So far as the British Government can check the outflow of India's lifeblood, they are bound to do it. Their being a foreign agency makes it all the more needful for them to be just to the subject population. If they are only reasonably just, just in the sense of ordinary business transaction, they will find India rich enough, at the end of a generation or two, to pay them perhaps fivefold in one shape or another.

Such questions, however, are too large and too abstract for the masses. [illegible] though touching them vitally, they do not press up[on] their physical consciousness in the daily affa[irs] of life. The people of India are interested in the[m] only so far as they are shown to touch their pocket[s] directly. But when Government resolved, for instance, to exempt Manchester cotton goods from the new tariff, the people undoubtedly felt that the rich and powerful had triumphed over the poor and helpless. They could not reason that Free Trade is one of the principal planks in the Liberal programme; that in matters like this and simultaneous examinations, the Liberal Ministry have to count with the Conservatives; that rather than weaken their position at home, or be shut out altogether from their sphere of usefulness abroad, the Ministers preferred to sacrifice far off India. Nor is it

easy for the people to see that the proceeds of a duty on Manchester goods would, as things stand, fail to reach their own pockets; or that, as an indirect result of the present position, the Government of India are enabled to resist the claims of the forward military school; or that the recent conversion of the Rupee Debt may have raised the credit of India so far, and averted fresh taxation, or at any rate given breathing time to the authorities. What is it to them, again, if officers in the enjoyment of salaries from Rs. 300 to Rs. 3,000 a month have a hard time of it and are losing heart? The average Indian critic, who thinks himself passing rich on Rs. 30 a month, cannot be expected to sympathize very much with a man on Rs. 3,000 having to pinch and scrape. He knows nothing about the invalid wife, living in one part of Europe, the children being educated in another part, whilst the official has to maintain himself in fair style in India, after paying away the bulk of his salary toward these and a number of other obligations. And well may his ignorance be excused him. Is he not himself more sorely pinched than the poorest amongst English officials in the country? Do not the Indians suffer more from the same causes that have led to the granting of a Compensation Allowance to the officials? The time for making the grant was certainly ill-chosen, whatever the justice of the action taken.

But the thing the Indian *can* understand is that the English are masters of the purse; that they

do what they like with India's resources; that they are really killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. It is in this light that he views our military expenditure especially. The crores that have been spent upon Burmah, on and about Afghanistan—taken from the mouths of the starving millions of India—have these been spent for India's own benefit, and not of England also? Then, why should not England give *her* share of these imperial charges? Why should not the rich partner show *mercy* to the poor, to the extent of doing her *justice?* This is what puzzles the simple-minded Indian, and well it may. Is it well it should continue to puzzle him longer? In his ignorance the ryot accuses the Sirkar of squandering millions of money abroad, whilst at home the Sirkar taxes his salt and fuel and oil; taxes everything, in short, that it can lay hands on. How could such a Sirkar or its officials know what a pinch of salt or a dry twig in the jungle means to him? Little does the ryot know that the Sirkar is as helpless as himself; indeed, more so, since the Government of India has scarcely the power of protesting against the exactions of the Treasury and the War Office in England. The position of the Government in this respect would hardly be envied by a shopkeeper's boy. They are often treated as a subordinate branch of the British Administration. They are not to spend what they earn, cannot adjust their own finances or devise their own schemes of taxation. They must earn so that their masters may spend the revenues, or help to spend them, on unproductive works taken up in the interests, not of

India alone, but of the whole British Empire. They have to feed upon the smaller Administrations in the country, in order to feed the Home Charges in England, the legacy of the old Purchase system which is primarily to blame for this *impasse*. A more anomalous position could hardly be conceived, or one more likely to take all the worker's heart out of his work. Practically, there is no such thing as a Government of India so far; it is a mere Administration, living from hand to mouth, living on shifts and expedients, tiding over difficulties that never come to an end; putting off the evil day, only to incur worse adversity and confusion. May it not be this financial dependence that has imposed upon the Government of India the necessity of diverting the Famine Insurance Fund from its sacred purpose? The same cause may explain the starvation of useful spending departments of the State—though that of Railways has been well kept in hand—the over-zeal of the Revenue, the Excise and other earning departments, and the neglect of urgent reforms in the Administration. That very cause, again, may account for the vehement, almost frantic efforts of some of the officials to whitewash the opium policy of the Government, in its economic and also in its moral and even international aspects. The dread of losing so much revenue at a time of stringent distress—though that was not what reasonable opponents of the policy desired—might well demoralize sober and self-reliant minds. For, is it not literally a position of shifts and expedients to which the Government of India have drifted? The

latest of these make-shifts was the bit of Currency legislation, which has exercised intelligent opinion so much. As if Exchange were the only or the main cause of the evil sought to be remedied! Government probably knew this was not quite the case. But they must have felt helpless before all the hubbub made, and before the pressure of expert opinion from home. They might have seen, however, that if falling Exchange was at the bottom of the situation, it was a secondary cause, in fact the effect of the primary and more potent cause, the abnormally heavy outlay, especially on the military side, much of which found its way to Europe, converted from the homely white metal to the garish yellow. No economies and retrenchments could avail in such a case, so long as the dependent country had to bear a burden so crushing. No fresh taxation, that could be devised, would fill the recurring deficits, even if Government had the courage to tax the classes with a voice to resent such taxation. The real remedy lies in England gradually relieving India of part of the burden that does not fall legitimately on her, and the latter Government availing themselves to the full of qualified and trained native agency—cheaper, if not more efficient, than the European—for the subordinate branches of the Administration. What can artificial legislation do in a case like this? However what is done cannot be lightly undone. Luckily this Currency legerdemain will not do much harm, if it does no good permanently. The experiment would have been better left untried. But now

that the plunge has been taken, Government must make the best of the new situation, or crawl out of it at leisure. Experience has shown how sensitive the Indian market is to the slightest disturbance—how rajas and zemindars make a rush on their banks on the first rumour reaching them, about a change of policy, or of war in the East or the West.

Apart from its material side, the moral aspect of this helpless dependence is much more distressing to the Government of India. It tends to make their hold more feeble, and teaches them to temporize in the presence of large questions of principle or policy. How could a foreign Government, with something like insolvency staring it in the face, risk the displeasure of the more active of its subjects, in the performance of duty? It is often constrained, much against its instincts and traditions, to humour the whims, to subserve the senseless prejudices of the people. It must wink at its native backslidings, put up with injury or insult to the body politic. Such is the power of the purse these days, that a Government, so badly stricken with poverty, and dependent withal on the will of its masters, must needs forego its privilege of initiating necessary measures of reform, undertaking useful works of progress. The Government of India is after all, but a human institution, subject to all the frailties of our nature, and groaning under all its limitations of power. Among the many dangers, real and imaginary, near and remote, that have begun to shake the confidence of well-wishers of India and of England, there is probably none that

requires to be faced so promptly and courageously. It is for the British statesman especially to tackle this most pressing of modern problems, a problem that has led to a group of minor problems any one of which is intricate enough to tax the skill of the executive in charge of our current affairs. In this respect India is decidedly worse off than any of the Colonies. But it is urged that if the country is unwilling to pay for the blessings of a settled and progressive government, she may shift for herself. This sounds very much like the last echo of the now discredited "Perish India" cry. Apart from solemn pledges given on behalf of justice and equality, it is forgotten that India and England have become one for good; that neither of them could possibly do well without the other; that this connection has be maintained in the interests, not only of the t countries, but of the British Empire at large. all means, have a fair return for your work and y risks. India is rich enough, if fairly treated, to pay, and more than repay, the cost of her admi tration. But no country, however rich or howe dependent, can stand a perpetual drain of h resources, due to a disregard of economic laws. L us pause to consider if, in sinking under the str of this financial injustice, India may not drag Empire down by the weight of her silent despa The poor ryot may not be able to grasp the wh situation clearly; but he has an uneasy feeling t he does not get the wherewithals of life so readily before, for instance, as his fathers did in the days the Moghuls and the Marathas. The wealth of t

country, in those days, remained more or less *in* the country, however foolishly it was spent. This the ryot is quick enough to perceive, but not so quick to appreciate security of life and property, railway, sanitation, education, and other blessings of peaceful progress. If there is danger anywhere, it lurks somewhere here. Let the masses in India have enough to live upon, possibly with a standard of living that has a tendency to rise. Avoid to tax the poor man's necessaries of life, to unsettle his mind with experiments in what is called Land Settlement, prevent the British soldier loafing about his homestead, his village tank or river; bring primary instruction within his reach; help him, with the aid [redacted]e educated and influencial classes, to the smaller [redacted] industries and trades. Above all, cease to [redacted]y him with new laws; simplify, codify, popu-[redacted]e the laws already in force; and see to it that [redacted]e laws are administered with as little executive [redacted]as is absolutely necessary, in the shape of rules, [redacted]-laws and other departmental devices. This [redacted]h, or rather this little, for the people.

[redacted]At the other end, you have to deal with the [redacted]nces and aristocracy of the land. Deal with them [redacted]t'y, and where justice needs, firmly. Do not [redacted]e them so much at the mercy of the Poli-[redacted]s whom Lord Mayo described as "dangerous [redacted]ials." Discourage the system of secret or confi-[redacted]tial reporting to Government. It lends itself [redacted]injustice without a chance of redress, and is [redacted] cause of serious disaffection among this class

of Her Majesty's alies and friends. No man, not the Raja, all men, should be condemned unheard. He has generally a large and devoted following, and the discontent that begins with one may end with hundreds and thousands. Avoid stultefying the Raja before his subjects. Do not think, because he smiles and says "Yes" to everything, that he does not feel. He is most sensitive when showing most indifference; most reluctant, perhaps, when showing the greatest willingness.

It is not to be denied that British influence on the administration of Native States has been, on the whole, salutary and productive of good for the people. The old idea, that the people live for their prince, has well nigh appeared; and the States, considered either as or administrative units, have begun to emerge the anarchy and intrigue of old. It is for the of the people, as a rule, that British interventio exercised; but the impression often lingers bel every act of intervention on the part of the Politi that it was due less to a love of the people tha a love of parading his own authority, with a das mild hatred of the Raja to give flavour to intervention. The love of supremacy, born w the average Briton, is accentuated, in this stance, by the position assigned to the Politi by his surroundings and by his ignorance or regard of the difference in ideals that sepa the new mode of administration from the And the better educated or more capable Native Prince is, the more determined seems to

the attempt to discredit his work and to degrade him in the eyes of the people. One result of this state of things, wherever it prevails, is the ascription of ulterior motive to every act and word of the Paramount Power, as interpreted by its Agent. The Durbar and the Agency thus breathe an atmosphere of mutual suspicion, destructive of co-operation and goodwill, though mimicking all the outward forms of social charity and official decorum. These remarks do not apply to all India, their scope of application being confined more or less to the Western Presidency. But if the same *system* obtains everywhere, it will be difficult for the reader to see how read is the danger to which it must or later give rise.

dly speaking, the personal relations between tive prince and his Political officer are more l to-day than they were before. And it is tem, under which these relations are regula- d not the officer, that is, as a rule, to blame is tension. Indeed, it speaks well for the als, as a class, that they manage to work so hly under a system so loose and irresponsible. o can say, this apparent smoothness does not sullen antagonism? To all appearance the al Agent or his assistant is all-powerful in ce: he is master of the situation. If himself a an, and surrounded by good advisers, he may a source of strength to the Raja, and a blessing subjects. Otherwise, whether capable or not,

he will become a source of weakness and dissension. The Raja has some skeleton in the cupboard, and the Political will hold his knowledge of it *in terrorem* over his head. The Chief must carry out the policy of the *Sahib*, accede to all his wishes, even his whims; or, he will be "reported." In that report, marked *Confidential*, it is open to the Political officer to abuse his position almost to any extent. The other party will have no opportunity of meeting the allegations against him, or justifying his inability to accede to the wishes of the accuser. In a majority of cases, the report stands good at head-quarters. What could be expected from such a system but domination by brute force? It is not to be supposed that the Chief is [redacted] blameless. If he were, the worst of Politicals [redacted] do him not the least harm. He often needs [redacted] guidance, and at times, control. But it [redacted] open, responsible, honourable control. [redacted] average Political qualified to exercise such co[redacted] His very position of immunity is apt to [redacted] even a good officer. Once he knows he can [redacted] and unmake kings, he will not scruple to s[redacted] his perrogative, especially if he happens t[redacted] surrounded by unscrupulous or intriguing s[redacted] dinates. The fact, that the aggrieved Ra[redacted] no chance of redress, save through himself, [redacted] the Political more reckless. How many in[redacted] men and women have suffered under this s[redacted] of reporting! And how many unworthy [redacted] have gained under it! Now, why should n[redacted] opportunity be given to the accused to mee[redacted]

accusations made behind his back? He may have some explanation to offer; he will at least have the satisfaction of knowing that he has not been condemned unheard. At present, he knows it is he, the Raja alone, less fortunate than the humblest of the Queen Empress's subjects, who is thus condemned without a hearing.

And what is the meaning of this system of confidential reporting? If it means anything, it presumably means that Government want to show they have implicit confidence in their agents accredited to Native Durbars. That these, "as officers and gentlemen," will be guilty of nothing wrong or mean in [redacted]relations with the Chiefs. This is fair assump-[redacted]o far; the Political may not perhaps be able to [redacted]is hold firm without it. But on the other hand, [redacted]l to which this theory leads in practice should [redacted] ignored. It is a real evil, and a very serious [redacted]ntensified with the presence of hot-headed [redacted]gsters in power. It seems to be more ram-[redacted]n some parts than others, though not neces-[redacted] from the same cause, nor always for the fault [redacted]he Political officer. Where it exists in a [redacted]nic form it makes the Raja shifty and secretive. [redacted]ay not be slow to use your own methods, and, [redacted]ps, your own men. Any secrets you keep back [redacted]him he will try somehow to worm out. He can [redacted]or them, and will not thank you for putting him [redacted]e expense. He will hate, and worse still, despise [redacted] when he knows the length to which you are [redacted]ble of going. He will do everything he can to

checkmate his tyrant, and finally settle down into a discontented grievance-monger. One such Raja may prove more troublesome than a hundred disappointed graduates. As it is, he seems to be driven, in despair, to doubtful associations. If he cannot do you harm, may he not connive at others doing it? If he cannot openly join a popular agitation, what is to prevent his supplying the sinews of war? He may help, in more ways than one, to discredit the Administration. Here is a danger to which the Englishman seems to be wilfully blind. And for what? For a mere sentiment, often an idle superstition, a fetich before which he grovels in his huge ungainly fashion. What is prest[illegible] without truth and honour to support it? Th[illegible] way to improve the relations between the Chie[illegible] the Politicals is, in all ordinary cases, to bring[illegible] face to face, to give the Chiefs some opportun[illegible] explaining themselves. There is no other wa[illegible] doing justice. And no other way of inducing[illegible] Political Bahadur to do justice in such cases, e[illegible] by showing that Government care more for ju[illegible] than for prestige. Here, too, is an opening[illegible] the educated talent of India. There should be n[illegible] of our educated men at the Durbar and at[illegible] Agency. They may be hard at first to get on [illegible] being too bumptious to bow the head or bend[illegible] knee. But for the same reason, they will be fa[illegible] more honest as mediators, more self-respecting[illegible] more intelligently loyal.

Between the Raja and the ryot, really stands this educated Indian, a product of western education and an admirer of western methods of government. You have equipped him for a new life, and yet condemn him to the old. Is this fair, desirable, possible? You have widened his horizon, and yet will not let him look beyond. You have taught him self-respect and independence, but will not bear him, now that he is beginning to assert himself. Why lose patience with him because of his impatience of guidance and control? It is natural he should crave for power and position. Try to sympathize with him, to utilize him as an interpreter. Divert his ambition into nobler channels; help him to go forth amongst his with a message of peace, goodwill and genetress. Infinite is his capacity for doing good, his power for harm-doing is not so great as . He lacks the hereditary prestige of the he strength of the people, lent by number. no sphere could the educated Indian be utilized than in that of internal reform— l, social, sanitary, industrial. Give him a and, under your supervision, if he happens in the Public Service. Avoid differential ent, as much as you can, between him and opean colleague. See to it that you do not im, by systematic injustice, either on the y or the civil side of the Administration, sort of outlawry against the reign of law rder. He knows your administrative and secrets, and as a public critic, will use this edge effectively, fighting you with your own

weapons. And bad as he is as an open critic, a discontended native in this position will be worse as a secret inciter of discontent. Here, too, the relations between the European superior and the Native subordinate would seem to be less sympathetic at present than, say, twenty-five years ago. Probably, things are not so bad as they seem. Manners change rapidly, and change of manners is often mistaken for change of sentiment. But there must be a solid residuum of estrangement still to account for; and perhaps the best way to account for it is to refer it straight back to the system of western education provided by the British Government with their eyes open. It cannot be too often repeated, that with more of this education the Indian acq[redacted] more independence. He learns to dislike lip-[redacted] and to value self-respect. This is gall and [redacted] wood to the narrow-minded bureaucrat who m[redacted] independence for disloyalty and self-reliance [redacted] gressiveness. He thinks the Indian ungrate[redacted] asserting himself thus, after profiting by the a[redacted] tages offered by education. He forgets, fo[redacted] moment, that the recipient of these advantag[redacted] simply trying to utilize them. That he is [redacted] precisely what the importers of European educ[redacted] required. This system of education was introd[redacted] after a hard fight, in the expectation of liberati[redacted] Indian mind; in short, for qualifying it for th[redacted] vileges and the responsibilities of British ci[redacted] ship. What an ungenerous, illogical attitu[redacted] mind his is, who quarrels with his fellow-sub[redacted] striving to make the best of the position they [redacted] been called upon to fill!

What the Political Agent is to the Chief and his Durbar, the Mamlatdar is, in a way, to the people in British districts. Like the Political Agent, the Mamlatdar, or the Collector Magistrate after whom he takes, is often looked upon as a tiger. Richand poor alike tremble before him; they believe he can put the most respectable man, within his jurisdiction, in irons, and march him off to the Police station. Has he not the Police at his back? Is he not virtually a four-armed monster?—policeman, prosecutor, judge and jury? This is at least what the ryot thinks, and you cannot induce him to think otherwise. In the case of the luckless Mamlatdar the evil arises [redacted] a different cause, from his exercising judi- [redacted]s well as revenue functions. He is more [redacted]ful in the mofussil than the whole [redacted]nment of India. The question of separat- [redacted]is judicial from his executive functions has [redacted] the souls of successive rulers. They fear [redacted] separation would involve a large outlay. [redacted] there are many who, having studied the [redacted]tion carefully, think it is possible to sepa- [redacted] the functions with but a small additional [redacted]ge. What is such outlay before the immense [redacted]f given to the people by thus clipping the [redacted]s of the Mamlatdar tiger? There is no [redacted]r official under the Administration, who [redacted]ers it so unpopular, as a bad Mamlatdar.

[redacted]Ve have now taken a turn fairly round India, [redacted] land of problems. Very perplexing are some

of these problems; but they all seem to arise out of, and also to merge themselves in, one big broad problem—the problem of Mutual Trust, proceeding from justice on the one hand, and forbearance on the other. On her side, England must do justice to India, not merely in regard to her material wants, but equally so in regard to her moral wants. It would never do for her to govern an Empire on trade principles—so much of purely administrative work for so much gold every year. That would be a perversion of England's mission to India. She is pledged to lift up this country to her own level of civilized life. The moment she ceases to redeem this pledge, she must expect to be re-
duced to the level of the dependent country.
seems to be the design of Providence; su
the teaching of History. Why should local
content, and class or race animosities upset
Paramount Power? Her hold on the masses
effective as ever. If a plebiscite were taken to-
the mass of Indian population would vote s
for British Supremacy. For, unreflecting
uncomplaining as this immense mass of hu
nity is, it can yet appreciate, in a dim sort
way, the security of life and property which
the first visible symbols of British Civilizat
The average Indian villager needs but a hand
of rice for himself and a patch of grass for
cattle. With these secured to him against
inroads of man and beast, and with the fruits
his industry or enterprise well within his reac

he will never be found willing to go back to Native Rule, or to any other from the outside, of which he is almost incapable of forming an idea. This is the one central fact; and India, with her gods many and her lords many, with her perjured witnesses and prophets of evil, dare not gainsay this cardinal fact. The rural population is deeply attached to *Ranika Raj*, even more so than to the eccentric paternal rule of John Company Bahadur. So far all is well. But how long will it continue to be well? With pressure on the soil increasing; with the standard of life on a rise, and the means of subsistence almost the same; with the educated classes engrossed [redacted]hemes of political aggrandisement—a natural [redacted] of the routine of education and asso- to which they have been subjected—and, [redacted]ir turn, ready to infect the masses with [redacted] ideas of liberty without the precious [redacted]poise of responsibility; how long is the [redacted]on to remian unaltered? Here, with all [redacted]rbearance that Great Britain can claim [redacted]her educated *protégé*, she may yet be con- [redacted]d with the problem of problems, the danger [redacted]angers.

[redacted] this brings us to the darkest phase of [redacted]oblem of Administration—the Position of [redacted]n. Till State and Society alike, in India, [redacted] the miseries of that position, and combine [redacted]tigate them, there is little hope for progress [redacted]od understanding. The present one-sided

activity is more or less doomed to disappointment, in itself a danger to be avoided. 'What could you expect from a nation whose mothers have to live in perpetual infancy?—married in their early teens, often to become widows before they are out of their teens. Can these be the mothers of heroes and patriots and statesmen? The women of India have really no existence, as apart from the men. Their life is one of dire dependence. And as are the women, so, naturally, must be the men—dependent upon others for almost everything in life, without a career and without the resources for working out their own destiny. They have nearly lost the power of initiative for purposes of self-improvement. The conditions of life seem to have become adverse to self-effort from within. A foreign Government lent the prestige of their own law to sor the customs and usages of the people, whicl for such prestige would have died a natural d Nay, this foreign Government, while proc ing their neutrality, have actually foisted own legal traditions on the domestic law of I Is it too much to ask them to withdraw this false position, and thus enable the rep tatives of the people to set their house order? There is no need of exceptional le tion, or of fresh expenditure. But when Government *practise* the neutrality they pr by simply declining to give *their* sanctio infant marriages?—that is, unconsummated in marriages or those under 12? When will

refuse to entertain the claim for "restitution of conjugal rights," or at least leave the matter to the discretion of the courts? This claim is foreign to the Indian sentiment, and has ceased to be entertained in England itself, whence it was imported into India. Is it not time, too, the Government afforded such facilities for social reform as have been promised time after time, in aid of voluntary effort, without which such effort must necessarily fail? It is sad to find the Paramount Power lagging behind even in the matter of an Enabling Act, when Native States like Bhavnagar, Mysore and Baroda have already taken the lead; and when the brave Rajputs of [redacted]tana have put a stop to infant marriages [redacted]e wicked waste of money incidental there[redacted]To whom are these reforms in Native India [redacted]y due? Why, to British officers, but for [redacted] advice and guidance they might not have [redacted]undertaken even by the more enlightened [redacted]ars. The initiative and the organization have [redacted] from our English friends. Is it impossible [redacted]Government and their officials to supply [redacted] essentials to British India under their own [redacted]ge? In the English-educated natives, on the [redacted]hand, and the heads of castes, on the other, [redacted]possess most useful interpreters. The former [redacted] the University Senates and the Local Self-[redacted]rnment Boards, for example, to work through; [redacted]latter have the panchayets for their instruments. [redacted]s earnestly to be hoped that the British Govern-[redacted]nt will meet their responsibilities in time, and

first, by withdrawing from a false position, and secondly, by showing the way to true national reform, help to build up a nationality worthy of their lasting partnership, and to solve a problem that has been approached from many sides, but has never yet been probed to its core. The marriage system of India is, indeed, her problem of problems; the mystery, the passion play of her daily life, stamping all her national concerns—arts, sciences, industries, commerce, and agriculture—with its own mark of premature development, arrested growth and early decay. Will it be otherwise in politics of which so many of our young men seem to be enamoured? The public life of a nation is but an elaboration of its family life. Where the latter is overshadowed by the pres
of the child-wife struggling with premature n
nity, or the spectre of the child-widow strug
with life-long penitentiary widowhood, it is id
expect justice, equality, freedom or independenc
the sphere of public affairs; idle, likewise, to ex
due appreciation of these qualities in others.
one must react upon the other. May not thi
the true explanation of the inconsistencies, the
realities, of our public life?—of our lack of vita
and sustained interest, of our want of business
bits? Against all these we seek outside initia
and guidance—hardly one great movement has
started in modern India without such aid.
where the monopoly of sex is concerned, we sp
external aid, even from the best of friends.
is not contended for a moment that India shou
adopt European ideals of life. All that is soug

is that she should go back to the older, wiser ways. A wife at 10, a widow at 12, (in many a case the age limits stand much lower), a mother at 13—these are monstrosities in the face of which it is madness to think of a consistent, progressive public life. And so long as this state of things continues, so long will the Indian Sphinx continue to laugh at the efforts of man to shake her from her purpose which is to puzzle, to mistify, and to undo the work of years. Let History bear witness how many movements, religious and political, she has swallowed up with calm unconcern, waiting for each of them to ripen only to be devoured.

BEHRAMJI M. MALABARI.

[redacted]Y, DECEMBER 1894.

SUPPLEMENT.

(From the *Indian Spectator* for November 4 and 11, 1894.)

A TALK WITH MY EDUCATED COUNTRYMEN.

Some of my friends in the native press are surprised to find Anglo-Indian writers approving of my views generally, while they are supposed to ignore, and sometimes even oppose, almost identical views ventilated by certain Congress organs. Well, in the first place, these friends assume too much in thinking that the Anglo-Indian press have approved of my views generally, as set forth in the memorandum or elsewhere. As a matter of fact, Anglo-Indian writers have demurred to not a few of my opinions and observations. It may be added here in passing, for information of the hypercritical, [redacted]y are quite wrong in believing or making believe that in [redacted]o. I have lavished praise on Anglo-Indian officialism or [redacted]on the Administration at work. Nothing of the sort. [redacted]rical critics take the trouble to read and to understand the [redacted]ey are panting to criticise, they will spare themselves [redacted] fit. In the present case, I have actually preached at the [redacted]as plainly, if not more so, as at the extreme section of the [redacted]s organization. It is true, however, that Anglo-Indian [redacted] is more ***tolerant*** in dealing with me than with others of [redacted]ms, just as I am more ***tolerant*** in dealing with it than are [redacted]my fellow-workers. In fact, the one is the result of the [redacted]There may be other reasons too. A Maratha writer, for [redacted], thinks that, as a critic, I have too much in me of the [redacted]human kindness. On the face of it, this appears to have [redacted]rce in it. Left to myself, I prefer love to hate, peace to [redacted]nstructive work to criticism or argument. But analyzing [redacted]n mind, I do not think I give more than their due to the [redacted]h. Here a little confession of faith may not come amiss, [redacted]lly as I am talking to friends ready to forgive faults of [redacted]r or training. To begin with, then, my ideas of journalism [redacted]eculiar, as was remarked two years ago by a French critic. [redacted]e journalism is not a trade, not a business, not even a profes-

sion; it is an avocation, a call, a holy mission. In this field of effort I have undertaken a humble rôle, that of an interpreter, a peace-maker. I know my place to be behind the heroes and warriors of words, the mighty speech-makers; and am proud of my obscure position. But my sense of responsibility is very acute. What an awful charge the building up and governing of this Eastern Empire is on the English! As an interpreter between them and my own countrymen, let me beware how I abuse my trust by ever so little deviation from what I conceive to be the path of duty as conducing to the common good. Very often I despair of being able to do good in my humble capacity, so difficult is becoming the task of governing India in her own interest. And when, at such moments, I see some weevil of a "we" denouncing the whole system of Government as a failure and a fraud, and offering to bear the burden of the Empire and its own little back, I cannot help feeling for the silent minority—a handful of foreigners, groping in the dark, feeling their way, inch by inch, maintenance of peace between antagonistic elements, to vency of the State and its security from foreign aggression, the amelioration of the lot of nine-tenths of its teeming In such moments of anxiety, with criticism running mad in quarters, I *may* be apt to become lenient to the official cla this is a defect, I am sorry for it. I have to confess other defect of character, too; namely to a natural aver rings. I cannot join a combination, cannot work in a ring instance, the Congress movement in the abstract is one dreams of my life—indicating the first awakenings of al life for India. But if you ask me to fall down and wors outward symbols—its huge pavilion and annual show, its hotels and unions, its resolutions made to order, and its mous votes—I must decline the honour. I cannot do thi do not quarrel with you for doing it. You may be the bett doing it; I am content to be the worse for omitting to do it a word, I am unfitted by nature to use the Congress, t always ready to be used by it for the good of the country. T cake-and-wine politics I am quite unable to contribute. But bring it nothing in this direction, by way of tribute, I also c nothing from it. Let those who understand the business n

the best of it. To me a Congress ring is as unattractive as an official bureau. Both may have their uses for others. But I do not feel drawn to them. The Congress Idea is sacred enough to absorb my admiration. With its methods, especially those flaunted by some of its native adherents, I cannot sympathize. This is perhaps a defect in character, and as a citizen I have to pay for it often and in many shapes.

With such mental attitude, is it very surprising if I judge the official less harshly than do his professional critics? If I work under certain drawbacks, I have some advantages, too, on my side. I have seen a good deal of administrative work in British India and elsewhere. I have had access to official and demi-official literature, vouchsafed perhaps to few outsiders. I have read a little bit of history for myself. I understand a little bit of human nature. And it seems to me on the whole, that India is better [redacted] now than under her previous rulers; better governed, [redacted]han she can be governed by any possible successors of the [redacted]om outside. I may go further and say that in some res- [redacted]dia is better governed under the British than almost any [redacted] the continent of Europe. Such being my view of the case, [redacted] but be an indulgent critic. I am ready to make allow- [redacted] the dfficulty of the situation, for mistakes that are inevi- [redacted]I try to put myself in the position of the rulers while [redacted]them. And all this I do, less from a sense of sympathy [redacted]gland than from a sense of the interests of my own coun- [redacted]r, I know that, for purposes of peaceful administration, to [redacted]ng of war, diplomacy or statesmanship, I am not the [redacted] well-educated English official. As a graduate of Oxford [redacted]idge, he will beat the best of us. And no wonder. Does [redacted]art with an immense advantage, inherited and acquired? [redacted]thing, he is the son of a free, intelligent, capable mother [redacted] had the moulding of his life. He is a man all round, a [redacted]an, an integer of humanity; not a fraction, like I am. In [redacted]d body, whether it be in the office room, the camp or the [redacted] is in many respects my superior. Can I help admiring that [redacted] stranger, working for and with a million of my country- [redacted] all classes and grades, striving to hold the balance, and as [redacted] facing disease and death in the performance of his duty?

But if he knows and works better than we, do we not pay him for it?—you ask. Of course, we do. He has not come out as a philanthropist. And even as a paid workman he is not an angel. He is slow, unsympathetic, suspicious and credulous by turn. On the whole, I am afraid he is deteriorating. But he is a capable fellow still, and believes in himself. He loves the people in a lofty paternal style, and sometimes makes an ass of himself in the same lordly fashion. Except when surrounded by parasites who have his ear, he is impartial as between Hindu and Musulman, though not often so as between Englishman and Native. As a human machine he is honest, grinding so much every day for so much of depreciated silver. As a citizen, that is as a non-official, the Englishman is willing to allow others to help themselves to the good things of life after he has helped himself; and now and then he may even lend a hand at the former process. Above all, he is for the weak as against the strong. Much of this is precisely what we want at this stage of our new civilization. We must [redacted] longer contact with the creature, if we require to get on [redacted] improve upon, the political education we have already [redacted] To ask for more power, without being prepared to acquit o[redacted] of the corresponding responsibility, would be a certain way [redacted] feating our own object. We must have more cohesion, a[redacted] greater power to work and to suffer. *When* the happy [redacted] come for India to become a self-governing nation, the eye [redacted] alone can see. I hope it may come, and come sooner t[redacted] most sanguine among us anticipate. But if ever the day [redacted] it is this contact with England and with the English mi[redacted] will accelarate its advent. It is from this contact mainly [redacted] have derived our ideas of equality and freedom, on which [redacted] of a nationality must rest. Anything that weakens the [redacted] makes this consummation more remote; anything that de[redacted] the contact points to retrogression, not progress. The [redacted] this we observe every day around us, in almost every con[redacted] life. It impresses itself upon every sober, impartial friend[redacted] gress. Such, at any rate, is my view of the position. It [redacted] wrong; and if so, I am open to correction. It is on this a[redacted] that I refrain from committing my journal to my personal o[redacted] The paper belongs to the public, any one of whom is welco[redacted] put me out of court.

ANOTHER TALK WITH MY EDUCATED COUNTRYMEN.

If the proposition stands, that more than half the evils of Society are self-inflicted, it stands to reason that Society is bound to devote more than half its aggregate effort to the removal of these self-inflicted evils. It follows, too, that the effort must proceed mainly from within, on the basis of self-help: for, according to that expressive Hindi proverb, *ápa mare bin swarga na jáe*, no one can go to Heaven unless he himself dies. These are practically the views of the Social Reform party in India. They feel that domestic and social reform must pave the way for political progress. But they do not insist upon this condition as a *sine quâ non* on the part of every individual worker. They are anxious, on the contrary, that a certain number of qualified men should devote themselves to political questions; others to national [illegible]s, not strictly political or administrative, and so on; with [illegible]hom the social reformers are equally anxious to co-operate. [illegible]lt, therefore, to understand why, in a certain narrow [illegible]e feeling prevails that social reform must always stand [illegible]n political progress, as a bad rival. Such violent divorce [illegible]able in the interests of civilization. Much more difficult [illegible]nderstand is the feeling, expressed in plain language, that [illegible]reformers are bent upon securing 'foreign interference,' [illegible]n of the law,' and many other dreadful things. So far [illegible]aware, the party of reform have never asked for inter[illegible]ny kind on the part of the British Government. They [illegible]ned, times without number, that certain wellknown [illegible] admitted as eating into the fabric of Society, the re[illegible]es of that Society should adopt a common basis of action [illegible]ose evils; and having determined upon such a basis, [illegible] the Government, which is *their* Government, to sanc[illegible]hereby make operative any such measure as the repre[illegible]s of Society have concerted for the common good. In [illegible]at the reformers want is the co-operation of the State just [illegible]tent of enabling Society to carry out its own programme The State is willing, as a rule, to give such co-operation,

when duly asked for. Are leaders of Society in a position to apply for it? Have they secured a basis of action, made a *bandobast* among themselves? If not, what are they waiting for? They do not deny the existence of the evils. Why, then, put off taking the initiative? Because, I am afraid, the power of initiation is lost to them. This is a serious enough misfortune in itself. But it does not end here. The lack of initiative is made up for by superabundance of opposition. Not only is every proposal to remedy the self-inflicted evils of Society to be opposed and clamoured against; but every attempt to amend a defective law, or to abrogate an imported law, to be frustrated. The opposition of certain Bengali journals of repute to the proposal, recently made by the Law Member, to leave the execution of the decree for the so-called "Restitution of Conjugal Rights," is a case in point. This proposal appears to have been drowned under an avalanche of words, more or less without any bearing on the point at issue, and probably raising the usual cry of "religion in danger," "interference with domestic questions" and so forth. This cl[illegible] critics will argue in a circle, always avoiding the centre of truth, they will not argue, but arguefy, creating imagin[illegible] culties to satisfy their love of argumentation. They logicians, and will chop logic beautifully fine. I think split a hair into more numerous fractions than I can saw wood into. Who can argue with these gentlemen? Not I, As a rule, I keep miles away from them and their argume[illegible]

On this occasion, however, I venture to have a little my Bengali friends as to the *facts* of this blessed 'Re[illegible] business. They may, perhaps, remember that the clau[illegible] 'Restitution of Conjugal Rights" was *imported* into I[illegible] eighteen years ago, a relic of the Christian ecclesia[illegible] This smuggling of a foreign law into India was, of cou[illegible] intentioned, the main object, I suppose, being to secu[illegible] mity. But we have the word of the importer himself, to[illegible] if he had known what would be the effect of the import[illegible] would not have attempted it. His excuse—quite valid[illegible] own ignorance, at the time, of the conditions of life in this [illegible] and the absence of a public opinion to guide him. He [illegible]

successors cannot deny that this importation of a foreign church law was an *interference*, on the part of the Government, with the marriage customs of the people of India. And they agree that Government ought to withdraw from this position in order to resume their much vaunted position of neutrality. My friends will thus see that what the reformers want is, not interference but withdrawal from the interference that has already taken place. They will also see that in a community among whom no marriage is properly *instituted*; that is, where no conjugal rights have accrued; where most marriages take place without the consent, often without the knowledge of the parties vitally concerned; there can be no *restitution* of conjugal rights. They will also see that the question is one of *law*, not of social custom; that it was as a question of law, pure and simple, that Government took it up in the first instance. And more than all this, my friends will see that the "Restitution" clause, having been done away with in Christian England, whence it was smuggled into this country, has [redacted]e shadow of an excuse for disgracing our statute book longer. [redacted] itself, is sufficient reason why the clause must go. The [redacted]t of India have realized their position, and have waited [redacted]e for a suitable opportunity to set themselves right [redacted] own conscience, or what shreds of conscience they may [redacted]to them. They now see an opportunity for some half-[redacted]ve, and are willing that the execution of the decree for [redacted]n" be left in future to the discretion of the Courts, [redacted]heir Law Member is for brushing aside the whole [redacted]thing. Well, the reformers are willing to accept even [redacted]le minimum of a concession to the claims of woman-[redacted] know that it it is less than justice. But knowing, [redacted]omen have little voice in India; that they do not [redacted] public meetings or write for the press, or otherwise [redacted]nds of Government, or lead an organized opposition; [redacted]o, that men in India have it all their own way, and [redacted]it very hot for the authorities if they choose; the [redacted]ry to make the most of this half measure. And what [redacted]itude of the reactionaries? Why, the same as usual, [redacted]*on-possumus*. They won't have Government retrace a [redacted]p. Government must not withdraw even from their false

position of interference, if they expect the approval and confidence of men monopolists. And Government is, after all human. So the reactionists think they will play the old game of opposition once more, the one played almost successfully at the passing of the Age of Consent Bill. Who can tell but that they may succeed this time? But what a success! Have these gentlemen counted the cost? Do they know how much they have lost, and with them all India, by their wanton, suicidal opposition of '90? In descending to such arguments as "we cannot allow our girls to remain unmarried after 10," they wrote themselves down as irreclaimable savages. In their lust for argument they painted themselves much blacker than they were; and the paint sticks to them. Are they going to give it an extra coating now? What is it to *them* if the Government of India see their own mistake and endeavour to correct it? Government did not consult the people before importing the 'Restitution' clause. Why should they consult the people before getting rid of it? And why should people care for what never belonged to them?—what is, in a slur upon their manhood? Think of marrying a girl of man of 25, and of the man claiming her person as so is 12, whatever the disparity between the two. Think of invoking the aid of a foreign law in dragging that tende cent child to his house, or to the nearest prison. Is father or brother in India, who can brook such an outra yet there are men, educated men, who, out of false p have the outrage perpetuated by law. Our Hindu fr never tired of reminding Mahomedans of their sin cows. If that be a sin of which Mahomedans are guilt forgive my asking how much greater is the sin of marry in her infancy, without her knowledge or consent, and the top of a bad social usage putting the whole wei worse foreign law—already discarded in the land of it to have that so-called marriage legalized? Let me beg gentlemen not to expose the country to further unmerited tion. They are not half so bad as, in the heat of argume show themselves to be. Their best course is to say to ment—do what you like with your 'Restitution' clause wh

never wanted, and which is really opposed to Hindu sentiment No Hindu, worthy of the name, cares for an unwilling wife. To force such a wife to live with her husband is not at all the way of securing happiness or honour.

As to the rest, let my Hindu friends try to move in time. Let each caste make its own arrangements for mending its marriage laws; and having come to a common understanding, ask the State, as their servant and executor of their common will, to ratify and sanction that understanding and thus make it operative. As I have said over and over again, ninety-ninth of the whole work rests with themselves; it is for the hundredth part, the vital, though not fundamental, that they have to seek the co-operation of the State. This being a foreign agency is purely an accident; it is *our* Government nevertheless. Let us utilize it, while we may, to [redacted]ry small extent. If we can do without it, well and good. [redacted]we? Have we ever been able to do so in the smallest [redacted]Let us take a case in point—Kulinism. This practice [redacted]"marrying" five, ten, twenty, forty, sixty, "wives"— [redacted]or position; "marrying" even without seeing them, [redacted]rning most of them all his life to neglect, and to the [redacted]rpetual widowhood, after his death; this practice has [redacted]mongst the *Kulins* or high-born Brahmins of Bengal— [redacted]hope, on a restricted area. The Kulins are probably [redacted]fluential caste in India, certainly the best educated. I [redacted]me of my dearest friends amongst them. How is it, [redacted]tically and intellectually the strongest caste have not [redacted]e to do away with *Kulinism*? For years have I been [redacted]ack the system, but have thought it wiser to leave it [redacted]sense of the caste. It is a self-contained little com- [redacted]can get rid of the evil in a month's time, if it chooses [redacted]our English friends the feeling obtains that the Kulins [redacted]not or dare not. My own impression is that they have [redacted]being so taken up with politics and literature. Like [redacted]ts and Shastris of Poona, who promised Lord Reay's [redacted]ent to do everything themselves in the way of social re- [redacted]eft alone for a time, the Kulins have not yet ventured to

set an example and to demand corporate action. Each waits for his neighbour to take the lead. Action in such matters leads to unpopularity; the priests and other monopolists, who live mainly upon bad customs, cannot be expected to approve of reforms in this direction. And as the priest cannot come up to the level of the English-educated Hindu, the latter is perhaps going down to the level of the ignorant priest. How else are we to explain recent agitations? The *Hindu* of Madras, in a couple of very thoughtful leaders, the other day, tried to show that the British Government in India, as an institution, sets a bad example to the institutions proper to the country. There is much in this way of looking at the thing. But it strikes me, the case might be put better the other way. May not the Government of India be losing in its moral fibre and grip of principle by contact with our indigenous institutions? In a word, may not the Government be coming down to the level of the people? Verily, the East is re[redacted] upon the West perhaps more than the West has acted up[redacted] East. This may be a triumph for latter-day Hinduism. [redacted] achieved, it will be found to be a dearbought triumph[redacted] some respects, England will suffer as much as India, th[redacted] greater sufferer on the whole will be India. Let my [redacted] countrymen take heed in time. Let them see that it [redacted] tish Government that will become their sheet-anchor [redacted] sea gets rough. They must expect nothing from [redacted] priests or monopolists of wealth and power. Thes[redacted] them as instruments, and drop them as soon as done w[redacted] can *they* appreciate Western education? Between tha[redacted] education and their own scheme of life and polity the gu[redacted] to be bridged in a few generations. If the English [redacted] to-day what will the educated Indians do? Have they [redacted] their position? Don't presume to much, my dear frien[redacted] influence either with the orthodox leaders or the peopl[redacted] Above all, do not think you have scored one by [redacted] Government away from this or that measure of duty. [redacted] not gained, but have lost, and lost heavily. The Anglo[redacted] a slow, selfish, practical fellow. When, on the one h[redacted] refuse to accept the Religious Endowment Bill, for instan[redacted] allow the "Restitution" clause to be got rid of; and, on th[redacted]

ask for this or that political concession, you make John Bull smile grimly and button up his coat. Instead of giving you anything more, he will growl to himself—"These fellows have had too much." John cannot stand nonsense; if he once makes up his mind that he has to deal with a set of peevish, impatient, inconsistent, irresponsible politicasters, he will know how to act. Very gloomy appears to me to be the outlook for such educated Hindus—on the one hand, alienating English sympathy in almost every direction; on the other, drifting further apart from the Mahomedans, as the latter growe higher in the social scale. But the subject is not a pleasant one to enlarge upon.

LIBRARY OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC

THE UNREST IN INDIA.

"HOLLY AND OLIVE BRANCHES."

A PAMPHLET.

BY

ARTHUR CRAWFORD, C.M.G.

[COPYRIGHT BY R. M. CRAWFORD.]

PRINTED AT THE
BOMBAY GAZETTE ELECTRIC PRINTING WORKS.
1908.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Preface: *A Sprig of Holly*	1
Seven Olive Branches—	
No. I.—History of the Unrest in India .	11
No. II.—What is the meaning of Swaraj—and of Swadeshi. . . .	19
No. III.—The Babu Press (*Extra Special*) . .	26
No. IV.—Whom do the Agitators expect to lead	44
No. V.—The Emigration Problem Solved .	53
No. VI.—To Islam in Ind	63
No. VII.—A Dream and a Prophecy . . .	67
Conclusion.	77

Ridicule the test of truth.

How comes it to pass, then, that we appear such cowards in reasoning, and are so afraid to stand the test of ridicule?

Shaftesbury, *Characteristicks. A Letter concerning Enthusiasm. Sec. 2.*

PREFACE: A SPRIG OF HOLLY.

"*The Spirit moveth me* before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of Death" [1] (which must be very soon now, seeing that I am nearly seventy-three years of age), to endeavour, by God's help, to do such small part as a poor old cripple may toward allaying the lamentable unrest that has for the past two years and more troubled India, especially Eastern Bengal.

It has been a source of unmixed satisfaction to me, who spent nearly thirty-five years in Western India, to note that the Vernacular and Anglo-Vernacular Press of the Bombay Presidency (with the exception of one Poona paper, and two or three worthless rags in the Deccan) have held aloof from the angry discussions that have convulsed Bengal;

[1] Book of Job, X, 21.

or, in alluding to them, have written with admirable prudence and in the best and most moderate terms. Knowing the Deccan as I do, I am not surprised. The Deccani Brahmins (as history proveth) are men of pith and prudence, prepared always to speak and write forcibly, and to the point, on any question affecting the well being of India. Their moral courage, it is true, oft-times fails them, but of their physical courage there can be no sort of question.

It is not so with the Babus of Bengal, who must not be offended at my plain speaking: for history proveth my contention (which I urge in no hostile spirit). Western India Brahmins and quasi-Brahmins (Shenwis, Prabhus, and Lingayets) are mentioned by the score as brave and able warriors. I know of no Bengali Babu who distinguished himself on the battlefield. Of course, I do not allude to Kulin Brahmins, mostly descendants of renowned Rajput warriors, whose renown for uprightness in Durbar and valour on the field of battle has been recognized for many centuries throughout the length and breadth of Asia. I am referring to the bourgeoisie of Bengal—the middle and lower middle classes; to traders, sowkars,

landlords, and the squirearchy; to lawyers and doctors; to students; and to aspirants for the Sirkar's patronage—whose name is legion—whose ambition is as boundless as their bumptiousness and vanity—and, alas! whose unscrupulosity and mendacity are only equalled by their selfish cruel disregard for the feelings and sufferings of others—whose rapacity and greed is only equalled by their narrow-mindedness, pusillanimity, and their treachery.

For them also there are many excuses to be made by every reasonable student of their lamentable history. Several centuries of cruel oppression of tyrannical suppression, in the most debilitating climate in all Asia—Bigotry—the adulation of their priestly pretensions, by the most superstitious peoples in the world, would have cowed the spirit, would have dried up the pith, would have killed the courage of any race on the face of this earth! Should we be surprised that these castes and sects, conscious that their intellectual powers are immeasurably superior to the people around them, *do* chafe, "dwindle, peak, pine" (as the immortal Micawber said of himself)? No wonder they are irritated, disappointed that a foreign race rules over them. In every blunder

committed by the old "Ján Koompani Báhádur" their ancestors saw (not without reason) an encroachment on their privileges as a privileged caste: in every well-meant reform since 1858 they have seen a crime, a barbed shaft discharged at their liberty of speech and action by foreigners, kindly disposed enough no doubt, but lamentably ignorant of the life and of the thoughts and feelings that actuate themselves. The most jealous and envious of all Asiatics, they have plunged into intrigue, have resorted to the meanest treachery in their untiring efforts to undermine the power of their rulers. "The galled jade will wince" (as saith the proverb), so they have, do, and ever will wince to the end of time. To human beings gifted beyond most men with astuteness, but persistently blind to the benevolent intentions of their rulers, any weapon has seemed God-given that may hamper the Sirkar or impede progress—even among their own countrymen, whom it is obviously their interest to keep in ignorance.

All this is only natural and to be expected. The British Sirkar could well afford to ignore covert sedition, to smile at the libels daily launched forth by the puny Vernacular press, and possess its mighty soul in dignified patience. No other

Government in the wide world would have been so tolerant. Bengali Babus know this right well, acknowledge it in their hearts; but so far from being grateful for the Sirkar's forbearance or regarding it as pure *mêhérbàni*, they resent it as an additional offence, and accordingly re-double their intrigues with Machiavellian astucity and malignity.

The secret fire in their hearts might have smouldered on for a century or more (like kindled 'shen')[1], eating into the minds of all Bengalis, burrowing, as doth a malignant ulcer, into the sinews of neighbouring provinces; but little harm would have been done amid peoples being slowly but surely educated by the Sirkar's munificence. The rural population marked with heartfelt gratitude the Sirkar's noble efforts to mitigate the ravages of famine, to abate the wrath of Shri Kâli in a hundred visitations by cholera, "Déwi" (named after her fiendish self), by flood, earthquake, and "all the ills that flesh is heir to:" the more enterprizing travelled beyond Kâla Páni to distant lands, bringing back to their homes wondrous tales of all they had seen and heard of the Great Queen and her easily-ruled subjects.

[1] Dried cow-dung, used as fuel.

Native Officers who had fought and bled in Asia, Africa, and China visited England, and returning, recounted in their cantonments the marvels they had witnessed, the splendours of the pageants at which they had assisted and had been specially honored by Royalty, and cordially—even affectionately—welcomed by cheering multitudes, wherever they went. The while the iron road was spreading almost imperceptibly over the land, and costly irrigational works, to prevent, or at least to reduce, the scourge of famine to a minimum were (and are) being constructed in every province, Native rulers emulating the Suzerain's power in each and all.

Thus, for many years, India was in comparative peace; the governors and the governed dwelt together in amity and mutual trust, with mutual forbearance for each other's fads and foibles. But, with fatuous folly—as foreigners (especially Germans) regard it—our Government permitted globe-trotters of sorts, and various breeds, to overrun Hindustan; hungry Company promoters hunting for concessions in the reputed home of jobbery (which it is not); mischievous M.P.'s blethering platitudes anent self-government; Radical Lords and lordlings propounding pernicious perverting theories; one and all sucking in lies greedily, with which the astute and

wily Babu preachers of sedition fed them as it were with pap, and, returning to England to write their experiences—their three months' experience (!)—and to garnish their unreadable, vapid, and unsaleable volumes with fables gathered from the gutter Bengali press, to furbish them up for repetition in the House of Commons; the while the golden guinea-piggers—disgusted and mightily disappointed at discovering honesty in the land of bribery—relieved their feelings by abusing the British Government in India and imputing to honourable officials of thirty years' standing dishonourable motives and unheard of atrocities before which those of Bulgaria and Armenia actually paled!

The Babu agitators were not slow to perceive their opportunity and to avail themselves greedily thereof. Can we blame them? Nay! Nor should we ever have blamed them if they had confined their lucubrations within the ring of truth, and to their own small crowd of admiring followers. But when they dared to publish broadcast absolutely unfounded falsehoods, to tamper with the native troops, to preach sedition in Beadon Square, and wholesale murder in the purlieus of Government House itself, it became time to show and use "the iron hand in the velvet glove.' Who will blame the Indian powers

that be for their too tardy action under such extreme provocation, followed (as it has been) by overt acts of violence and bloodshed, and cowardly assaults on inoffensive persons ?

It would seem as if a reaction has set in. Ishwur grant that this may be so, but in Ind it "'t is always the unexpected that happens." The prediction of soothsayers and astrologers were portentous of great trouble on the 30th of December last, when the National Congress assembled at Surat. "Aries (*i.e.*, the Aryan) has come into conjunction with Saturn (the god-planet of revenge) and re-acting in concert against Capricorn (Great Britain), whose lustre, culminating in this its tenth decanate, is to be dimmed and to die out, first in Central India."

"When Aries has arisen over Hindosthan, Capricorn wains and falls from heaven." Then (says the Berar astrologer) there are to be "insurrections and insubordination among the sepoys, as a warning to the Sirkar. Are they warned ?" (asks the soothsayer) "of terrible bloodshed on and after the 3rd of January, when there is to be a total eclipse ? All are and will be fulfilled."[1]

[1] The above is quoted from a Sanscrit almanack annually issued by certain astrologers of Berar : these were their predictions for 1906-1907 and 1908.

I reply: "Yes! the Sirkar *is* warned *(I have warned it.)* The Sirkar is fully prepared for any eventuality. Woe! woe! woe! to those who dare to strive against British Power in Ind!"

But a truce to these ratiocinations! Let us return to our Olive Branches!

Most of my readers doubtless have heard tell of the tale of Noah and the Great Deluge: it will bear repeating for the edification of the half-educated.

Eastern Europia and Western Asia—the fairest regions in God's universe when Earth was young—grievously offended their Maker by their wickedness. Noah and his family were the only inhabitants who feared and served their Lord: so God sent an angel to warn Noah that on a certain day he would send a mighty deluge of rain to destroy the impious. Noah was, therefore, directed to build a huge vessel or Ark wherein to bestow himself, his family, and a pair (male and female) of every living creature, so that when the Divine wrath should be appeased, the animal kingdom might be renewed. Noah and his sons Shem (Shem was, it is supposed, the forefather of Aryans), Ham, and Japhet obeyed

God's behest. For forty days and nights rain fell in torrents till the earth—even the mountains—were submerged, but the Ark floated safely on the waters. On the morning of the forty-first day, Noah heard a tapping on one of the shutters, and on his opening lo ! a lovely little white dove was there bearing in its tiny beak a fresh-plucked olive branch. Then the Noah family knew that the Divine wrath had subsided : immediately the sea of waters subsided rapidly and the Ark grounded on Mount Ararat. The olive branch was a token of God's reconciliation with mankind. The little white dove was the emblem of his Merciful Spirit, which has from that time been represented as a white dove descending from heaven.

In humble, in reverent imitation of these Divine miracles, I tender to my Aryan brethren a small sprig of holly bound up with olive branches plucked from the garden of an old man's memory; and I beseech you, my friends, to accept the humble gift from one who has passed more than half a century in working for India and her peoples. He craves the consolation of knowing that you have been reconciled to the great Sirkar before he dies and *"shall be no more seen."*

OLIVE BRANCH No. I.

HISTORY OF THE UNREST IN INDIA.

The greater part of my Preface may be taken as itself an Olive Branch. However, for symmetry's sake, I have numbered this No. 1.

Mindful of St. Paul's injunction to the Corinthians (I Cor., ch. xiv, 40) "Let all things be done decently and in order," I will begin by briefly sketching the *history of this pitiful unrest in India.*

Matters Indian were pursuing their ordinary humdrum routine when the Marquis of Ripon became Satrap in succession to the versatile Earl of Lytton. There had been two very unpleasant occurrences in the latter's Satrapy: (1) The Cavagnari massacre at Kabul, followed by the inevitable expedition by way of Kandahar and Sibi to the Capital of Afghanistan (consequent on the Maiwand disaster) ; and (2) a recrudescence of seditious writing in the Native Press, followed by Lord Lytton's abortive and most ill-advised attempt to muzzle the Native Press. But

(as I said) the State engine was running on level rails when Lord Ripon mounted the Viceregal chariot. The new *"Lat"* Robinson of that ilk was not received with much enthusiasm: Orientals rarely respect or regard with favour renegades from the faith of their fathers. Moreover, Lord Lytton had become *persona grata*, especially in the Punjab and the North-West Provinces, despite his flightiness and eccentricities (which were amusing) and his errors (which were grave); and her graceful Ladyship had ingratiated herself with all classes. The magnificent pageant at Delhi to proclaim her late Majesty Queen Victoria Kaiserin-i-Hind occupied the attention of a people to whom such displays especially appeal.

A year or two passed before the Ripon régime rivetted the gaze of malcontents in Bengal.

They had not previously attached much importance to the vapourings of Sir A. O. Hume, the Home Secretary (a most amiable and experienced official): he was regarded, not without reason, to have *"a bee in his bonnet."* But we all have some bees in our brains, or our *topees*, or our turbans (I, who pen these lines, have a hive full

of Iberian bees buzzing in my brain!): his lelw-known theories on self-government for India were received with no particular enthusiasm until—(here, writing of Hume, the famous ornithologist, my metaphor naturally becomes ornithological)—until, in two words, Lord Ripon, unnaturally laid two speckled eggs at Peterhoff (unkind persons vowed that they were goose's eggs)—one was *Swarâj*, the other was *Swa-déshi*. Mighty was the cackling in the Viceregal poultry-yard that ensued at this portentous birth! All the Babu bantams, all the Deccan Bráhmas, hurried up to Simla to offer their services to his Lordship, who, being of a peripatetic breed—a mere *ranch-baras walla*, or glorified five years' globe-trotter—could not be expected to sit upon his eggs himself. There were plenty of Dorking fowls of the Covenant breed eager to act the part of incubator, with the obvious intention of smashing up the eggs incontinently. In the result, the biggest Babu bantam was entrusted with the Swa-râj *baida*; the Deccan Bráhma (a very fine fowl) sat upon Swa-déshi; Swa-râj hatched out first, when, to the horror of the denizens of the Peterhoff poultry-farm, a cockatrice broke the

shell! The Bengal bantams, however, were delighted: they brought the unfledged bantling down to Calcutta, fed him on scorpions, lizards, and white-ants' eggs till he was like to burst: no sooner did his head and tail feathers sprout, his comb and wattles to appear, then he began to peck viciously at all and sundry—crowing the while in defiance of all mankind. The Babu bantams were mighty proud of the little rooster (as one may well imagine), and crammed him daily with pepper-corns and pellets of Anglo-Indian "*Dailies*," mixed up with chili vinegar and mercurial ointment.

The Deccan Bráhmas were much more prudent with Swa-déshi. They fed him mainly on soft food for his morning's meal—rice, warm porridge, thickened with hard-boiled Sanscrit eggs (of which they always keep a large store) ; at mid-day they scattered sound hard Deccan gram before him and let him run free about Bamboorda and the vicinity of Government House at Ganeshkhind, where they took infinite care that Sir Richard Temple's evil glass-eye should not fall upon their precious bantling. Moreover, they patrolled round Kirkee, lest that cursed Commissioner of the Southern and Central

Division (himself a famous breeder of fancy poultry at Moola Lodge) should shoot their promising pet. Swa-déshi grew up a fine fowl with tail feathers that would have gained him first prize at the Crystal Palace, and such sharp spurs ! Such a crest and comb ! Each morn he woke up Poona City with his sonorous *"cock-a-doodle-do"*—so different from the shrill, squeaking falsetto of Swa-râj over in Calcutta. It was quite a pleasure to hear him make the welkin ring.

Months rolled on: Swa-déshi's Bráhma foster-parents found him a handsome well-bred harem from a setting of eggs generously contributed by certain Sirdars of the Deccan (who shall be nameless).

A very fine cross-breed resulted, which were respectively named *The Maratha, The Kesari, The Poona Vaibhao* (a very vicious cross-bred cockerel—always in trouble, often stoned by Rao Bahadur Mahadeo Rao Burve, Regent of Kolhapur, and others on whose flower-gardens he persisted in trespassing). *The Vaibhao* and *The Kesari* shortly afterwards took to roosting on the same perch, and crowing on Poona dung-hills. Then there was *The*

Sivaji—a true-bred Maratha cockerel—and some insignificant roosters of the Wai strain. The most celebrated cockerel of Swa-déshi's begetting was the *Deccan Herald* or "*Deccan Times*" (I forget which), purchased for His Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad by an enterprizing Eurasian—great was the delight of His Highness when this most pugnacious fowl killed off all the prize poultry that Colonel Marshall had imported at great cost for the Public Garden.[1]

For some reason or other, the Swa-déshites and the Swa-râjites did not get on very well together on the rare occasions of their meeting. In one or two bouts they had together Swa-râj showed an unmistakeable white feather and was much mauled by Swa-déshi in the Congress cockpit. Anyhow, these two rival breeds have never intermarried or exchanged pullets, until lately for a brief period—which is perhaps fortunate for the peace of both farms.

The ancients said that cockatrices were hermaphrodites! Quien Sabe? Whether that mythical

[1] This actually took place in H. H. the Nizam's Zenana in 1856. The ladies of His Highness' harem, unable to visit the Public Garden, besought the Nizam to have all the valuable birds brought to the Palace, where they were all turned loose together.

bird was a suicide or not (like unto the Phœnix) we know not, nor does it matter. One thing is certain —that Swa-râj has had no progeny, which is fortunate for Bengal and all Upper India. The stalwart uncompromising "*Bande Mataram*" comes of a much purer strain—is a learned, instructive, even an amusing fowl, when he can so far restrain his appetite as to keep his curved sharp beak out of the red inkpot of sedition. This bad habit (which has grown upon this promising rooster) recently brought him to considerable grief—he escaped a miserable death by a miracle. We trust he will be more prudent in the near future; if he is not, he will inevitably go to pot (which is rhyme, though I meant it not!). About the Deccan, Bombay, and Guzerath poultry, we are quite easy, so long as they follow the lead of those grand old roosters *Native Opinion* (a pure bred Chitpâwani Bráhma), the "*Jam-i-Jamshed*" and the "*Rast Goftar*"—fine portly birds of Parsi parentage. It is not difficult to foretell the end of the Siamese twins "*Vaibhao*" —"*Kesari*"—either they'll quarrel and get Dr. Goodnufbhoy Bistourijibhoy to sever their connecting ligament (which is but too likely to be fatal to one or both of them), or they'll have their

scraggy necks wrung by indignant neighbours for waking them at ungodly hours.

As I hinted above, Swa-râj is dead—a miserable *felo-de-se*, or he will die from the wounds inflicted by the prize Mogul game-cock two years ago in the Calcutta cockpit, and in December last at Surat.

I defy you, my friends on the Hooghly, to deny that this very ornithological metaphorical description of the growth of the Unrest in India is essentially accurate in general outline: Yea! even in most of the details of the little history.

OLIVE BRANCH No. II.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF SWA-RÂJ AND SWA-DESHI?

My Babu friends, Swa-râj does *not* mean "*Local Self-Government,*" such as the Marquis of Ripon imported into Ind. It is—as you very well know, you wily ones, when you abused it—literally translated, "*self* (*Swa*) *kingdom*" (or *monarchy*), which is a very different thing! In a word, it means *sedition* in all its naked hideousness and horror and blood-shed—neither more nor less! And as *sedition*, you Bengali Babu Editors preached it daily. Now, the Deccan Brahmin Editors (pardon me for telling you the naked truth!) are educated on a much higher plane; they (I mean, of course, the editors) have Sanscrit at their fingers' ends, and know the occult meaning of mystic phrases in the Vedas, as it is only known and taught at Benares, Trimbuck, and Nasik—as you, my good Babus, can never know it. Deccan Journalists never used the term *Swa-râj*,

except in quotations from your poluplosboic [1] journals. They were much too wary, too honest, and far too intelligent. Such modest, moderate phrases as "*Swabodh,*" "*Swa-déshi,*" are employed by their "*affluent orators*" at the meetings of their Sarwa-jânik and other Sabhas.

The Editors of West India "*have their English*" (as the Scotch say) much better than you with all your boasting. You will not find in any Deccan paper "*poluplosboic*" (much resounding), pollysyllabic sentences such as are to be found in every page even of your best journals.

You will not find in the Deccan "*Dailies*" or "*Weeklies*" Shakespeare, Shelley, or Keats inappositely or otherwise misquoted. Any student of the Deccan College or school-boy at Elphinstone College would be ashamed to write such nonsensical English as appeared in a famous pamphlet published some twenty or thirty years ago by one of the most learned Babu gentlemen in Calcutta.

---

[1] "*Poluplosboic Thallasses*" (the much-resounding Ocean). Ulysses (I think) is made to use this phrase by Homer in his Odyssey.

WHAT IS TRUE SWADESHI IN INDIA?

Elsewhere, a few weeks ago, in writing on this all-important conundrum, I quoted a recent letter to the London *Times* from a (presumably) Bombay correspondent on this very subject. My Native readers may not have seen this admirable article—I shall, therefore, take the liberty of quoting largely from it here. The writer begins :

"In one of his earlier speeches in India, Lord Curzon remarked that 'the country is in the strongest position whose capital is self-generated and self-employed; and the first duty of the patriotic Indian, instead of carping at those who have profited by his neglect, is to enter the field, though late in the day himself, and to utilize the wealth that he has inherited or acquired for the benefit and the development of his own people.' Lord Minto pursued a similar line of thought in a speech last year, with more immediate reference to questions of the moment, when he differentiated between true and false Swadéshi, and intimated that the genuine Swadéshi movement would always have the support

of the Government of India. 'Swadéshi' really means 'own country.' In Bengal, the word has been utilized to designate movements for the boycott of foreign goods, for fomenting labour troubles, and for creating internal disorder. Large numbers of people were induced to take the 'Swadeshi vow,' which pledged them only to purchase home-made fabrics: but the one or two attempts of Bengali agitators to start industrial enterprises on an extensive scale ended in a fiasco. In other parts of India, prominent men have for many years been steadily pursuing a genuine Swadéshi movement long before the term gained widespread currency. The Jute Mills of Calcutta are mostly controlled by Europeans, but the cotton spinning and weaving mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad and Nagpur have been, to a great extent, started and maintained by Indian capital. In the industrial world of Bombay the Indian capitalists have long been supreme, and they have built up great undertakings without allowing political controversies to affect their aims."

And concludes thus: "Large undertakings of this description, carried out under Indian auspices, represent a spirit of true Swadéshi which cannot be too

warmly praised and encouraged; but we search in vain for their counterpart in Bengal."

The sympathetic correspondent is, of course, correct in his definition so far as he goes: but he does not go far enough. "Swadéshi" means very much more than "own country"—nor does that render its import accurately: literally translated it means, of course, "of, or belonging to our own country"; the 'i' converts '*désh*' into an adjective.

"Swadéshi" includes patriotism to "*our own country*"—not the least of all virtues: a true patriot is—must be—a true altruist, unselfish, self-denying, never self-seeking, humble yet proud (with proper pride, mark ye!), and (above all) humane, honest, truthful, and modest. Do ye possess these noble virtues, these Buddhistic attributes? Are your orations, your editorials, either honest, humane, truthful, or modest? Oh! ye Babu editors! Ye delight in poetry but rarely quote Oliver Goldsmith; his "Traveller" (line 60) cries exultingly:

"(I am) Creation's heir, the world, the world is mine."

And at line 73:—

"Such is the patriot's boast, where'er we roam,
"His first, best country ever is at home."

And his humanity and brotherly love are well portrayed in line 7 and following :—

"Where'er I roam, whatever realms to see,
My heart untravell'd fondly turns to thee;
Still to my brother turns, with ceaseless pain,
And drags at each remove a lengthening chain."

Ye often quote Milton, but in all probability never read his prose. This is how he describes a patriot—in a word—what *you* ought to have become after the College and University education ye have had :—

(Milton's "Tractate of Education"):—"Enflamed with the study of learning and the admiration of virtue; stirred up with high hopes of living to be brave men and worthy patriots, dear to God, and famous to all ages."

Have ye been so enflamed? Have ye admired, do ye admire virtue? Do ye desire to be famous, or are ye writing and orating to be infamous to all ages?

In verity, many of your utterances make the hair of reasonable readers stand on end! for ye calmly, doggedly, day after day, propound dogmas

"That would have made Quintilian stare and gasp."

Can ye claim for your

Chaste muse that she has employed her heaven-taught lyre,

None but the noblest passions to inspire,

Not one immoral, one corrupted thought,

One line which, dying, ye could wish to blot." [1]

I trow not! All Ind knows (as Butler says in his "*Hudibras*") that

"Nick Machiavel had ne'er a trick

Ye don't play in public mighty slick!"

---

[1] *Vide* Lord Lyttelton's "Prologue to Thomson's Coriolamus."

[2] "*Hudibras*" (Butler) the Poet adds: "Though he (Machiavel) gave his name to our Old Nick."

OLIVE BRANCH No. III.

TO THE BABU PRESS.

(Extra Special!)

Despite your many sins against decency and humanity, there are many allowances (not excuses, mark ye!) to be made for your recent revolting seditious ravings. No human being can daily, hourly, take 'nips' of "Scotch" or absinthe without becoming intoxicated: nor can even a Bengali Babu surfeit himself with ghee without vomiting forth black bile and emitting acrid eructations, sooner or later.

Now, ye have been committing both these imprudences for some time past. What, in Shri Kâli's name, could it matter to you that the Sirkar should find it administratively necessary (after many years of calm deliberation) to separate East Bengal from the rest of the Province—a step, by the way, that had long been urgently demanded? How did it affect you that your fellow-countrymen in East Bengal should have the local Government of their part of the Province located in their midst,

easily and cheaply accessible to them? You ought to have applauded the reform as being obviously beneficial and convenient to your East Bengali compatriots, who cannot possibly be injured thereby. But ye went on, hammer and tongs, day by day, till ye vomited venom, tinged with blood; and then came Don't Keir-acuss Hardie, M.P., and talked you into frenzy. Mind ye, no reasonable man questions the honesty of *his* motives: we all respect him—as honest men respect men who have raised themselves by sheer industry and integrity from the status of day-labourer for wage (he began life as a miner) to prominence in Parliament: we take his vapourings for what they are worth—which is just nothing: we know that he, too, has been carried off his legs by the exciting scenes he witnessed—the virulent abuse of the Sirkar with which your agents in East Bengal plied him sedulously. We doubt not that he believed, because seeming respectable Pressmen told him, and the *Bande Mataram* printed (headed in heavy black type):—

Armenian Horrors in Calcutta—Murderous Assaults on Innocent Wayfarers—Most Cowardly and Harbous (query—barbarous) *Conduct of the Police!—They* (the Police) *go to Bexdon Square to Rob and Assault Passers-by!*

The Special Correspondent of the London *Times* supplied to that journal part of the leading article in which the *Bande Mataram* describes (as if the editor himself had witnessed them) the "horrors" thus accentuated. I quote :

"'Any Bengali, knowing not what was taking place, who happened to pass that way, was at once set upon by the policemen, and after being beaten to jelly, were either let off or sent to the thana . . . . At about the same time (9 p.m.) were seen 20 bodies, covered all over with blood and gaping wounds, lying at the south-west corner of Beadon-square. . . . Some 50 policemen paraded the Beadon-street and here and there lay in ambuscade and fell upon any solitary Bengali they met with. They most inhumanly thrashed any Bengali they found, and most frantic and agonizing shrieks were heard from road (and) houses of women and children till they were silenced by successive heavy blows of *lathis*. Armenian or Bulgarian horrors pale into insignificance before the barbarities in the Indian quarters committed by the chartered and privileged *goondas* of Calcutta. . . . . All the houses and shops within a mile of Beadon-square were kept locked up and closely

shut, and dead silence and darkness prevailed everywhere, except for the dying shrieks and agonizing cries of those bleeding and unfortunate men—the victims of the all-powerful but cowardly and barbarous Calcutta police. But still it must be said, to the credit of the European policemen, that they did not behave so cruelly and inhumanly as the direct agents—the up-country and Moslem constables. . . . The police, unable to do any injury to those who punished them so deservedly on Wednesday, was mean and beastly enough to vent their rage on women, children, and innocent old men. . . . The show of Police force yesternight was so immense that all these atrocities had to be borne by the Bengalis without a word of protest. But it is sure that the fire thus kindled by these alien policemen will never be extinguished, and the Bengalis will either be totally removed from this world or pass over all this in silence. The honours of our women are not safe in Calcutta. People are in momentary fear of being looted and dishonoured by the paid *goondas.* Already (in) some places ladies were said to have been insulted in the neighbourhood of Beadon-square. The most critical point in the life of the Calcutta and West Bengal

Bengalis has come, and it behoves them to rise to the occasion and save the honour of their women, which is in great jeopardy. . . To be or not to be, is the question, and whole India is eagerly and anxiously waiting to see how the Bengalis come out of this ordeal.'

" This sensational and utterly misleading 'description ' of the rioting was obviously intended to stir up the passions of the Bengali populace, and thus to incite further lawlessness. The police arrangements happily sufficed to prevent a continuance of disturbance, and in a subsequent number *Bande Mataram* was constrained to apologize for its exaggerations. "

The last eight lines, of course, are the correspondent's own: they will at any rate show you what the public opinion in England is of such unprincipled journalism.

Again, read what your old friend, Lord Cromer, said on the subject at the Mansion House:—

"Just at present some of the youth of India and Egypt appear to be basing their political conduct on the proceedings of agitators in this country, and I notice indeed that, with what I certainly consider almost culpable folly, an itinerant member of Parliament—Mr. Keir Hardie—appears to have accepted

the ill-regulated enthusiasm of a portion, and that certainly by no means the wisest portion, of the community in Bengal. The agitators in India will, I do not doubt, should the occasion arise, be kept well in hand by the firmness and sagacity of the Viceroy, and of the eminent statesman who now presides at the India Office. *(Loud cheers.)* For my own part, I say, I see but one method of dealing with this unrest and disturbance in Egypt and in India : it is to continue steadily to do our duty towards the people of those two countries—to come down with a heavy hand upon Extremists, should they overstep the limits of the law, but not to be deterred by their presence or by their proceedings from adopting such reforms as are calculated to satisfy the aspirations of all moderate and reasonable men. *(Cheers.)*"

Thinking it probable that the *Times* is not available to the majority of my Native readers, I have here printed extracts from that journal's latest leading articles, summing up, with admirable impartiality, the position of the Government of India, of the Moderates, and of the Extremists, which it (*The Times*) sets out with characteristic plainness. All Anglo-Vernacular journalists would do well to ponder on these words of combined sympathy and wisdom :—

LORD MINTO'S WARNING.

(*"The Times," Monday, November 4th.*)

"The speech of Lord Minto at Simla, upon the passing of the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, reported in our issue of Saturday, is the clearest and most emphatic declaration of policy regarding the present symptoms of Unrest in India which the Government of India has yet vouchsafed. It calls for, and we hope it will receive, the warmest approval. It gives a stern warning to the seditious demagogues who are doing their best, with speech and pen, to turn India into a welter of disorder; but it recalls the real leaders of the Indian peoples to a nobler sense of their imperative duties, and it recognises with amplitude and sympathy the growth of legitimate aspirations which no wise Government would seek to stifle.

"Mr. Gokhale, whose sincerity is unquestioned, but whose manifold activities have certainly not been always soothing in their effect, sought to show that the agitators were few in number. That is

only true by comparison with the myriads of people in India; and it is not Mr. Gokhale we have to thank that there are not more. Mr. Gokhale himself abstains from inflammatory speech, but too often he remains in silent association with those whose tongues are less circumspect. When he defines his position more clearly, when he makes it more manifest that he abhors (as he should abhor) the tactics of those of his co-adjutors who are seeking to rouse evil passions in India by the worst of means, he will command greater confidence and more respect than can be the case to-day.

"Lord Minto, at any rate, is not to be led astray by smooth asseverations in Council, intended to minimize the gravity of symptoms unfortunately unmistakable. He sees, as all who have followed the course of events must see, much evidence of an organized and systematic attempt to undermine the stability of British rule in India.

"The really pregnant portion of the most notable speech Lord Minto has made since his assumption of the Office of Viceroy is found in his appeal to 'the leaders of Indian thought.' He tells them that, while the Government is resolved firmly to repress sedition, it does not wish to check the

growth of political thought. It is conscious of the birth of those vague and unstudied aspirations which are sweeping through the venerable nations of the Orient, and stirring the dry bones of Asia. To endeavour to stem them when they are natural and legitimate would be not only futile, it would also be inflicting a grave wrong upon peoples who are perfectly entitled to respond to the unseen promptings of the new and stimulating influences at work around them. But what the Government can, and should, and will do, is to guide the fresh ideas and hopes into the right channels; and meanwhile they can summon to their aid and take counsel with those intelligent Indians whose sympathies with changing conditions have not degenerated into a wild craving for anarchy. 'We must rally the Moderates,' said Mr. Morley at Arbroath; 'we must appeal to the better mind of educated India.' Will they consent to be rallied? Will they prove responsive to our appeal? Lord Minto wisely reminded Indian reformers of the heavy responsibility that rests upon their shoulders. Are they bearing the burden courageously and bravely? There is only too much reason to fear that at present they are not, and that they will show some reluctance to answer the rallying cry. A

strange want of moral courage is one of the most marked characteristics of Indian public life. There are large numbers of capable and cultivated Indians who regard with the deepest aversion the dangerous sedition which the new Act is meant to repress, but they are too timorous to bear witness to their convictions. They fear criticism, and are singularly sensitive to the vulgar abuse of the disreputable vernacular sheets sold in the bazaars. They will even hold out the hand of fellowship to those whom they know to be steeped in seditious and disloyal practices, rather than incur odium from any section of their countrymen. The real mischief-makers are encouraged in their campaign of disaffection by the knowledge that at the most they will only receive the silent disapproval of their own people. Until a bolder and manlier spirit pervades the Moderate party in India, until its leaders are inspired with the determination to dare all and speak out courageously, they cannot be held to have discharged the grave responsibilities resting upon them at this juncture. But if they are true to themselves and their country, if they will say to the world what is in their hearts, if, conscious of their own high purpose, they will meet calumny with contempt and

abuse with scorn, then out of the present evils good will have flowed. The best brains in India are still on the side of order and peaceable development ; and if only those who are qualified to take the lead were more deeply imbued with moral courage, the need for the new Act might soon pass away."

THE DECLINE OF INDIAN AGITATION.

(*"The Times" Friday, November 15th.*)

"The more hopeful tone of the telegrams from India published in our issues of yesterday and Wednesday encourages the belief that the country is, to some extent, emerging from the influence of the disturbing propaganda which has for many months kept it in a state of unrest. The Extremist party, we are told, has for the time being collapsed, and the Moderates have regained the control of internal political movements which they should never have lost. That the Government of India is satisfied that the recent ebullitions of disorder and incitements to violence have spent themselves is clear from the termination of the period of detention which the agitators Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh have been undergoing in Burma. Had the Government thought that these individuals were likely to renew their inflammatory speeches, or that fresh activity on their part would find receptive soil for their efforts, they would hardly have been released. Lajpat Rai found an ardent though

unconvincing apologist some time ago in Mr. Gokhale, but the immediate calm which followed his summary removal from the Punjab is sufficient proof that the step taken by the Government was a regrettable necessity. Ajit Singh is a person of less prominence but more directly mischievous tendencies. He lay under the suspicion of seeking to tamper with the loyalty of the Native Army. If in their term of seclusion in the fort at Mandalay these two stormy petrels have learned the unwisdom of their dangerous experiments, no harm should ensue from the signal clemency which has restored them so soon to freedom. While the suggestion that India is entering upon quieter time must remain for the present a fervent hope rather than a strong conviction, signs are not wanting that common sense and prudence are gaining the upper hand among Indian politicians. The Extremists never really represented the preponderating bulk of informed Indian opinion. They gained a temporary ascendency by making a great deal of noise, and by appealing to those classes in whom the exuberance of youth or an inherent liking for disorder chiefly predominated; but their wild and often ridiculous excesses were regarded with the utmost aversion by

most sensible and thoughtful Indians. The stern intervention of the authorities, firmly though mildly directed, began the undoing of the Extremists; they completed it themselves by their recent disgraceful behaviour at Nagpur. That city is usually quiet enough, and was specially selected as the venue of the next National Congress because it was thought to be least liable to the incursions of drilled rowdies. But the Extremists professed to hold that a preliminary meeting of the Reception Committee was 'unconstitutional,' and their emissaries broke up the gathering. They showed their aptitude for self-government by pelting the Moderates with stones, and by breaking the heads of the Moderate leaders. The incidents that occurred caused a feeling of deep disgust throughout India, and Mr. Chitnavis, a respected member of the Viceroy's Council, felt compelled to resign his post as chairman of the committee. The scene of the coming Congress has since been changed to Surat, in the Bombay Presidency, where Moderate influences, exerted mainly from Bombay, are believed to be strong enough to prevent any renewal of disorder. Meanwhile, the Extremists appear to be utterly discredited.

"Their manifest collapse is a striking vindication of the policy of firmness and wise repression which Mr. Morley has stedfastly pursued in the face of an ill-informed and sentimental opposition in this country, and of rabid vapourings in India. No one can say that the Extremists did not have enough rope given to them, or that there was any undue haste in chastening their malignant ardour. No one can say that the measures adopted, either personal or legislative, have erred on the side of severity. They have achieved their purpose, because for the time being the Extremist movement has ceased to be of serious account; and if on his return 'Don't Keir-acuss Hardie' seeks further to justify the exuberance of his Calcutta utterances, we may invite him to contemplate the instructive spectacle of the disciples of his associates in Bengal, hammering moderate members of their own organization in their zeal for political freedom. Even to the Extremists, however, we would not deny an opportunity to regain by more reasonable procedure, the confidence of their fellow-countrymen and of their rulers. They must be judged by their future deeds. Mr. A. C. Banerjee, a well-known Calcutta barrister, has been relieved from the charge of sedition pending

against him on his tendering an apology to the Government. He says he '*will be more careful in future.*' We trust he may; but the measure of Mr. Banerjee's repentance will be the degree of his abstention from the boycott propaganda which he and the *Bânde Mâtarâm* invented, to the injury of Bengal. India has need of her able and educated men for worthier objects than that. She needs them for the guidance of the political thought of her peoples to truer and nobler purposes, for her educational and industrial regeneration, for help in the practical work of fighting famine, for aid in the removal of those distressing prejudices which directly tend to foster the continuance of the dreadful scourge of plague. The statement regarding the unfortunate scarcity in the United Provinces made by Sir John Hewett at Allahabad, and the appeal issued to the Vernacular Press by Sir George Clarke in Bombay—for help in encouraging a general recourse to inoculation against plague—both serve to draw attention to painful problems which concern the immediate welfare of the peoples of India far more nearly than vague political aspirations. In grappling with these problems, more particularly in the fight against famine,

the splendid traditions and the trained efficiency of the British Administration are seen at their best; it is when the sufferers flock for aid to British officers, even from Native States, that the taunt that they are out of touch with the masses is most effectively disproved; but though famine work must always be in the main an official responsibility, British officers would approach it and many other great tasks in India with more certainty of success if they knew they could reckon upon the support and aid of the many talented Indians whose energies are now dissipated in unfruitful ways."

If we could resurrect Lord Macaulay, Edmund Burke, Lord Bacon, and John Bright as a Committee to consider and report on all that has been written in and out of India, and on all that has occurred in India since this lamentable unrest first made its appearance in Calcutta and East Bengal—and could Cicero be present as Honorary Secretary to draw up a précis, that August Committee would be unable to beat these two leading articles for conciseness, accuracy, and prophetic plainness.

Every Native Editor should print them in the largest type—should frame, glaze, and hang them up

facing his editorial table—to refer to and guide him when the spirit again shall move him to indulge in "tall" or other sedition-suggesting writing.

There is yet time—not too much time, however—for the offenders to eat humble-pie, to chew their leek. If they foolishly dally with or neglect the opportunity, they will assuredly find the pie-dish pieless, the leek poisonously bitter, and will hear in the rattle of every passing ticca gharry's wheels "Black Maria" driving up to take them off to chowki. "Black Maria," they may like to learn, is the nickname for the prison van.

OLIVE BRANCH No. IV.

WHOM DO THE AGITATORS EXPECT TO LEAD ?

This is a conundrum that I imagine it would puzzle even the *Bânde Mâtarâm* Editor to solve !

Do Babus perchance propose to lead the Rájput princes, or the Máhárájahs of Gwalior, Indore, and Baröda, of Kolhapur, of Idhar, of Bháwalpore, or His Highness the Nizám, or His Highness the Máhárájah of Trâvancore ? Does he count upon the countenance of the Máhárájahs, of his fellow (but far superior) caste princes, the Máhárájahs of Benâres and of Vizianâgram ? He well knows that he, a comparatively obscure Babu journalist, has already been scornfully ignored by one and all of these noble and enlightened potentates and by every Deccan Sirdár and Thâkur of Kathiawâd.

In Bhowâni's name—I ask—who then *does he think* he may lead, or seduce from their allegiance to their Suzerain ? Echo answers mockingly "*Who ?*" He has been mighty unsuccessful in his puny efforts to corrupt the Native Army. Is he fatuous enough to believe that any number of thousands of the stunted

ignorant peasantry, noisy mobocracy, and pursy shopocracy of Bengal, commanded by his ignoble self and all the Bangherjees in Bengal, with a staff selected from the shock-head young, swelled-headed students of Calcutta and Dacca, will face the warlike Pathâns and Sikhs of the Punjab, the sturdy Mahratta warriors of Máhárâshtra, the wiry little Madrássis, whose ancestors routed all the troops that the tyrant of Bengal could array against Lord Clive exactly one hundred and fifty years ago?

The notion would make Englishmen hold their sides with laughter, were it not that all reasonable men deem it pitiable to see intellects that might exercise beneficial influence among their fellow-countrymen, shaken by such mad and blood-thirsty dreams as they have been revelling in for two years past.

Alas, Bánde Mátarámjee! Hast ever looked in a chevalglass, hast ever compared thy puny physique with the massive frame of yon burly Sikh warrior, yon puissant Rissaldár of Punjáb Cavalry, yon grim old Marátha Subèdar-Major? Their trade is war; thine is quill-driving. More's the pity! Thou knowest the Latin adage, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.* ("Let

the cobbler stick to his last.") Stick thou thy stylum behind thine ear, empty thine inkpot of that bloody ink, sit thee down on thine hunkers and begin a fresh unsullied page while thy printer's devils deliver to a passing *bunghi* (sweeper) thy pestilential productions of the past few years to be burnt, with other filth, at the municipal incinerator outside the city. Then

> "A sadder and a wiser man,
> (Thou'lt) rise the morrow morn."

The devilish leading article day by day penned by thee "Doth work like madness in the brain."

> .' O, that way madness lies ; let (thee) shun that."[1]

Thou art mighty prone to quote Edmund Burke —the mighty orator who mistook coolies for Afghans and mixed his coolies with his Afghans fierce, in ignorance terming the latter "ferocious Dhoolies" (Look up thine Hansard's Parliamentary Reports for 1842). Well, I'll give thee a dose of Burke, and eke a couple of rashers cut off Bacon, for "My vigour relents, I pardon something to the spirit of liberty," though thou hast abused it shamefully.

---

[1] Hamlet.

Thou hast not remembered that ye are "A people who are still, as it were, but in the gristle, and not yet hardened into the bone of manhood." . . . Thou hast "made and recorded a sort of institute and digest of anarchi, (and hast) called it the "Rights of Man".[1]

Thou hast forgotten that "all government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter."[2]

Oh! man! man! what a Frankenstein hast thou created for thyself! What a Quinbus Flestrin!

> "(A) book-full blockhead, ignorantly read.
> With loads of learned lumber in thine head,[1]"

whose tongue is like a sharp sword "at (whose) every word a reputation dies." What kind of monster is this, *Bánde Mátarám*? One may "destroy his fib or sophistry—in vain! The creature's at his dirty work again."[3]

---

[1] Pope's Essay on Criticism, Part III, line 53.

[2] Pope's Rape of the Lock, Canto III, line 16.

[3] Pope's Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, line 91.

What time thy man-mountain assembles a shock-head crowd of school-boys.

"Fire in each eye, and papers in each hand,
They reve, recite, and madden round the land."[1]

In all thy malevolence, O Mátarám!

"Thou hast damnable iteration."[2]

Day by day, in season and out of season, dost thou ever

"Cry 'Havoc'! and let slip the dogs of war."[3]

"It out-herod's Herod."[4] . . . .

"This is the very coinage of your brain."[5]

"Thus bad begins and worse remains behind"[6]

"But yet the pity of it, Iago!
O Iago, the pity of it, Iago!"[7]

Thou, who dost occupy the editorial chair of *Bánde Máturám*! What wondrous good thou mightest have done! What wise counsel mightest thou not have imparted to thy followers! Nay! what wise

[1] Pope's Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, line 5.
[2] Shakespeare's King Henry IV, Part I, scene 1, Act 2.
[3] Julius Cæsar (Shakespeare), Act III, scene 1.
[4] Hamlet, Act III, scene 2.
[5] *Ibid*, scene 4.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Othello, Act IV, scene 1.

counsel mightest thou not have given in the Viceroy's Council Chamber, but thou hast preferred to wreck thine honor — art in a fair way to wreck thy fortunes, and to imperil thy liberty.

And what I say unto thee, I say unto all thy fellow-journalists, who are following in thy footsteps.

And now for the rashers cut from the loin of thy favourite Bacon. He writes of Truth: "No pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage ground of truth." Thou cans't have enjoyed little scant pleasure then!

Again in his preface to his "Maxims of the Law," the profound philosopher writes:

"I hold every man a debtor to his profession; from the which, as men, of course, do seek to receive countenance and profit, so ought they of duty to endeavour themselves by way of amends to be a help and ornament thereunto."

Hast thou, have thy brethren of the Anglo-Vernacular Press of Bengal, performed that duty and thereby been an ornament to any honourable profession?. . . I pause for thy reply, but thou hast none! but wilt almost to a certainty assail me with foul abuse for my plain-spoken, yet sympathetic criticisms.

Men speak of thy caste as "the wily Brahman"; thy characteristic craft forsook thee when thou dids't make overtures to Islám to join in sedition! Why we, white men, know the Moslem race, "Nature's gentlemen," far better. *We* never doubted them!—Beshrew me!—but the Babu Press has stirred up a nest of hornets which will drive ye into the Hooghly's muddy stream! *You, You!* to teach Moslems! You! to dare to ask Islám to accompany you in your downward course to dishonour, to don the garb of treachery—by all your gods and goddesses, this is *too much!*

Yet another fatal error hast thou made—at which, however, white men do not marvel, seeing that it is the natural consequence of centuries of oppression, treachery, treason, followed by absolute, abject submission, and servile cringing to oppressors.

Just as you have ignorantly imputed cowardice to the most courageous race on earth,—mistaking their sublime resignation to the decrees of their *kismet* in their unmerited degradation in Ind—to pusillanimity—so you have mistaken the mild tolerance of your British rulers of your extravagant pretensions, and their patience heretofore under your

gross provocations and seditious attempts to breed discord in the vain hope of undermining the British Raj to pusillanimity. Little do you comprehend the British character after one hundred and fifty years' study of it.

I must fain administer one last copious dose of Burke, to open your minds and eyes, and then I shall be done with this distasteful topic. I quote from your favourite philosopher's "Reflections on the Revolution in France":

"Because half-a-dozen grasshoppers under a hedge make the field ring with their importunate chink, while thousands of great cattle, reposed beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field,—that, of course, they are many in number,—or that, after all, they are other than the little shrivelled, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome insects of the hour." . . . "And having looked to Government for bread" (as you have on the very first scarcity) "they will turn and bite the hand that fed them."

Oh ! my Babu grasshoppers ! doth not this describe you and the attitude of the Sirkar toward you to a T ?

May years bring wisdom to you all, so that you may no longer be deceitful, treacherous, cruel, and blind leaders of your blinder fellow-countrymen—made blinder, mark ye, by you. May content, peace, and plenty—goodwill and good fellowship and universal charity reign in Ind, and be firmly inaugurated in the near future.

OLIVE BRANCH No. V.

THE EMIGRATION PROBLEM SOLVED.

Greater Britain, Canada, the United States of America, and the South African Republics are all much exercised at present on the momentous question as to what to do with the East Indians who are flocking to their shores.

England herself—in London and in Parliament—is also perplexed by a problem of which no statesman has yet discovered a solution; and yet, "*to the man in the street*" and to the travelled Briton, the solution seems simple enough!

Meanwhile, the poor Indian emigrants and all those from China and Japan, are being, to say the least of it, most inhospitably received. Now, John Chinaman and Jimmy Jap have their Legations, or their Consuls-General or Consuls, at hand to appeal to: emigrants from those nations, moreover, are

turbulent as a rule, are usually well-armed and very well able to take care of themselves. Not so the gentle Hindu and patient Mahomedan peasant or artizan. They have also, it is true, the British Consulate to refer to for redress, but its officials know absolutely nothing about them, have many other Colonial axes to grind, and grumble "*Que diable font-ils dans notre galere a nous?*" The Indian Government is far distant—almost inaccessible even—to their poverty-stricken relatives in India. As a result, the unfortunate Indian emigrants are not merely neglected (that might be endurable) but are treated brutally and inhumanly, if the accounts we hear are well-founded.

This is a grievance on which the *Bándé Mátarám* (or indeed, all Native Journals) might with justice expend the vials of their wrath; no one could (or would) blame them; but they have been curiously silent there-anent heretofore.

Again, because the London *Times* may not be accessible to the majority of my readers, I give below *in extenso* its admirable leading article on the subject, which voices public opinion in England, but does not suggest a remedy:—

THE COLONIES AND NATIVES OF INDIA.

(*The "Times," Monday, October 28th.*)

"Our special correspondent at Vancouver calls attention to-day to a phase of the agitation against the immigration of Asiatics, which raises a peculiarly serious and difficult question for the Imperial Government. While certain classes object violently to the presence of Asiatics of any nationality, they have apparently found themselves able to influence the administration of the law in such a way as to give practical effect to their sentiments in the case of Natives of India. Immigrants from India are apparently treated with greater rigour than other Asiatics, not by the regular method of making special rules for them, but by unfair discrimination in the working of general regulations. It is always possible to work immigration laws either in a liberal or in an exclusive spirit; but the complaint of our correspondent is that they are administered as against Natives of India more harshly than against any other immigrants. Our Indian fellow-subjects are excluded by the immigration officers

upon the flimsiest pretexts; and the thing has gone so far that the steamship companies refuse to carry any more Indian immigrants to British Columbia. That means, of course, that, no matter how careful they may be to see that the people they carry are eligible for admission, they have no guarantee that admission will be granted, and, therefore, can no longer undertake the risk of having to carry these people back whence they came. These are poor people, not sent by any organization in India, but emigrating on the recommendation of friends and relatives in British Columbia who are doing well and are described as contented and law-abiding. Trusting in the Imperial Government, they have broken up their homes and often sold everything they possessed in order to pay their fares. They will be carried back to India destitute and sore with a sense of betrayal. When they tell their stories in Indian villages it is easy to understand in what light the Imperial Government must appear to the population, and what a splendid instrument is thus placed in the hands of agitators and sedition-mongers. It is easy, too, to understand the embarrassment of moderate men loyal to the British raj, when they are taunted with its inability, which will be

translated as unwillingness, to secure even so much as equality of treatment for its Indian subjects.

"The whole question of Oriental immigration into the white man's countries is an exceedingly difficult thing to handle. That the white man should enter the territory of an Asiatic nation is regarded as a perfectly right and proper thing. That he should force himself and his religion, his commerce, and even, in too many cases his vices, upon nations that did not always assimilate those obtaining wherever European civilization is brought in contact with the latter.

"In the first two or three years of the century, glowing accounts had been circulated of the delightful climate and fine opportunities for pastoral development offered by the high plateau region, and no adequate means had been adopted of coping with the sudden rush of settlers—mostly from South Africa—who responded, in perhaps unexpected numbers, to the invitations issued. The fundamental drawback consisted in the absence of any survey of the land available for settlement. Some idea of the confusion that existed may be gathered from the fact that the average time that elapsed between the

date of application for a grant of land and the date of registration.

"The poor Indian immigrant has no desire to incur a delay that may average six months. He does not seek to graft vices upon nations that do not want to have anything to do with him and seek only to live their own lives in peace. Surely, this is not only right but meritorious. That he, the Canadian, Australian, or Transvaal inmigrant to India, should force the Asiatics to give him concessions of railways, steamships, mines, and anything else that he may covet, is thought entirely just and equitable. But when a few hundreds or thousands of these Asiatics go to a white man's country, not as conquerors, or monopolists, or *concessionnaires*, but simply as humble labourers, offering labour for low wages which satisfy their frugal requirement, there is wild excitement, political agitation, and mob violence. But if these Oriental races enter the white man's country, whom has the white man to blame but himself? He laboured very hard to stir up all these quiescent races, who did not want him, and did their best to remain in their ancient ways. He was warned by his own wiser teachers that some day he would succeed and that he would have cause

to be sorry. His own political economy taught him that people who work sixteen hours a day, who do not drink, who live with a frugality of which he has no conception, must prove terribly formidable competitors with nations who limit their work and their output, and who live expensively. He would not listen so long as he could wring concessions from the Asiatics and compel them to trade at the point of the bayonet. He is now going to find out that his teachers were wise and his political economy sound; but he is taking in a very mutinous and unreasonable spirit the A B C of what is going to be a long course of lessons.

"What is at the bottom of all the agitations now going on for the exclusion of Orientals? Race antipathy? Incompatibility of ideals? Not at all. These things are superficial. They are laid aside when convenient. They do not stand in the way when white men can make money by exiling themselves among Orientals. At the bottom of the whole affair is economic jealousy. In Vancouver, in California, in the Transvaal, in Natal, in Australia, the real objection to the Oriental is that he is too frugal, too industrious, and too efficient. But these are economic factors that cannot be combated by

violence or by exclusion ; and the sooner that fact is recognized the better will it be for the white races. The fight in the places we have named is really against the white man's own peculiarities. He buys in the cheapest market, otherwise the Oriental would not be there. The Japanese, Chinese, and Natives of India are employed by white men although they are persecuted by other white men. They may be mobbed in San Francisco, but the fruit-growers of California cannot do without them. Their labour makes possible great industries for which efficient white labour cannot be found. They perform many minor tasks which white men have become too proud to perform, although our vaunted civilization cannot get on unless they are performed. But Labour—with a capital letter—which will not do these things itself, is furious at the spectacle of their performance by the Asiatic races. It is equally furious if white men from other places perform the tasks which Labour disdains or works for."

Thus, the *Times*, with its usual impartiality, presents the question to the British public.

Now, there is a great deal to be said for the Consular query : *What the devil are they doing in our ship?*

What are Asiatics, inured to a hot climate, doing in countries where for half the year or more, even white men perish from cold? What are the baits proffered to the poor ignorant fellows by emigrant agents touting in India for coolies for this or that Colony? Why does the Government permit their poor lamentably credulous peasantry and artizans to migrate to climes where at least fifty per cent. will perish from pneumonia, where all are unwelcome and shamefully neglected, or worse?

Is there no one at or outside of Simla or Calcutta to contradict the falsehoods which the emigrant agents must be propagating? Is there no one to suggest that the poor creatures should either voyage to Uganda, where they will find a congenial climate, good wage, and live under the ægis of a stable British Government—or to Brazil, where they will see Swadeshi under the most favourable circumstances, or to any of the Mexican or River Plate States, to British Guiana, any one of which Government would gladly welcome their arrival in any numbers, and (like the British public in Lemco's advertisement) "*Ask for more.*"

It is the obvious duty of the Government of India, to prohibit emigration to uncongenial climes, and to act on the hint here given.

Meantime, let the *Bánde Mátarám* editor and his *confréres* read up about the countries I have named, and write about them. Especially let them purchase the admirable booklet published by *The Sphere*, entitled "The Great United States Republic of Brazil" (price one shilling nett, without postage). Once Indians have exploited Brazil or Mexico in any number, the surplus population of India will speedily drain off to the admirable Republics aforesaid.

OLIVE (AND MYRTLE) BRANCH No. VI.

To Islam in Ind.

"The star of the unconquered will.
O' fear not in a world like this,
And thou shalt know ere long,—
Know how sublime a thing it is
To suffer and be strong." [1]

A pamphlet such as this would be sadly incomplete—would be emasculate, this Olive Branch would lack its myrtle, its envelopment of bay leaves would lack fragrance— did it not contain sprigs of thyme and rosemary bound round with cord of kindly greeting to the historic race that has so staunchly stood by the British Râj throughout this lamentable unrest in India, despite the "cold-pausing caution"[2] and persistent neglect of the needs of an impoverished people who once ruled from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin. That caution, perhaps, was necessary after a brace of Wáhábi fanatics—probably maddened by some drug—took

[1] Longfellow's "Light of the Stars."
[2] Burns's "Epistle to James Smith."

the lives of a just Judge and of a noble Viceroy, for which foul deed Moslems must be no more blamed than Babus for the Jubilee murders. That caution may or may not have been called for by circumstances. It may have been "*a wise and salutary neglect.*"[1] Laymen are not competent Judges ; it is for the experts at Downing Street and Whitehall to decide ; ours is but a limited purview ; theirs extends over not only India, but Eastern Europe, and all Africa—especially Egypt. The British F. O. and the India Office must act (or not act) according to the progress of events in all those vast regions, keeping a watchful eye over the "sick man" at Yildiz Kiosk, lest his vagaries disturb not merely the march of good government in Egypt, but the peace of Europe and the peaceful progress of India.

To all Anglo-Indians, however, who are not "*Nimmuk Harâmis*"[1] (alas ! there be many such !) or infected by the exploded and pernicious doctrines of "*Swarâj*" the persistent, stern neglect of Islám's interest and welfare since 1857 appears not only ungrateful, but unjust and imprudent. For half-a-century Moslems have fought for us and bled beside our troops in countless, hard-fought,

[1] Burns's "Epistle to James Smith"
[2] Faithless to their salt.

hard-won battlefields—while their nobles, middle classes, and peasantry have steadfastly stood firm to our rule in India, resisting a hundred opportunities to retaliate, scornfully rejecting overtures made by Blatant Babuism to join in futile efforts to undermine and shake the British Râj.

Ought we not (Anglo-Indians ask) to requite such constancy? Is Great Britain to accept great favours from the hands of the loyal Moslems who uphold her rule, and to confer none of them? And to continue to lavish honours and treasure (for their education) on a class that has not only shewn itself ungrateful, but actually now defies her to her teeth.

While Hindu ryots of the Deccan and Tâlukdars and Grâssias of Guzeráth have been—are still being—relieved of their liabilities by her bounty, and laws are passed for their protection from the rapacity of Hindu usurers, the poor Moslem peasantry of Bengal and the North-West Provinces have been left utterly unprotected from similar oppression—worst of all, the impoverished nobles and gentry of Islam have been cruelly left out in the cold. These be bitter truths, readers mine, reflecting sadly on our administration.

The author of this brochure, from within a few months of his landing, a callow youth, at Bombay,

has persistently advocated for fifty-two years, that (as in Ireland, Guzeráth, and the Deccan) Encumbered Estates Courts should be constituted to rescue ancient Moslem families from penury, and that the State grants to Mádressas should be largely increased.

It is as difficult to understand this apathy of the Sirkar as it is easy to perceive its ill-look to observant patient Islam. Money cannot possibly be an obstacle in the present prosperous conditions of Indian finances. A few lakhs—even a crore or two of rupees—would be as a drop in the ocean: there is absolutely no risk—it would all be recovered with reasonable interest within reasonable time.[1] We picture to ourselves (we Anglo-Indians do) the beneficial effect of such tardy, but even now timely benevolence to Islam in India: we seem to hear the Mullahs at every mosque and musjid in Hindosthân praying to Allah and his Prophet to bless the British Râj!

So mote it be, my Moslem friends, in the coming new Year! Ameen! Ameen!

Mean time "Khoda Háfiz!" as your great Poet said (may God make you of a pleasant countenance!).

[1] The writer was privileged to succeed—but (alas!) in but few instances—at Satara with the aid of Mr. John Nugent Rose (the Commissioner); and at Bijapur with the sympathetic sanction of his late much-lamented friend and school-fellow, Sir James Fergusson, then Governor of Bombay, in the case of the Pir Sayed of Shahpoor (mentioned in the chapter on Bijapur in "Our Troubles in Poona and the Deccan"); and with the sanction of the Marquis of Ripon (1884) in the cases of the Nawabs of Cambay and Habsán.

OLIVE BRANCH No. VII.

A DREAM AND A PROPHECY.

The writer is much given to dreams and (strange to say) they usually come out true, and his prophecies regarding unrest have mostly been fulfilled as those who, perchance, have perused his books will have perceived.

Well, readers mine, after perusing the *Weekly Times*, wherein the subsidence of this lamentable unrest in India forms the text of the powerful leading article printed *in extenso* already—after pondering painfully on the present position of affairs in Ind—I wondered if the "latest intelligence" really indicated the beginning of the end; or whether, despite the admirable and timely clemency of Lord Minto's Government, worse is to come, as foretold by the Berar astrologer.

"Is this only a lull before a greater storm?" I asked myself, and musing on the problem, fell into a deep sleep wherein I dreamed as follows :

I was walking in Hastings Street, Calcutta, in the early morning : I met my old friend (or thought I did) Mr. Rustomji Maneckji, formerly Sheriff. To my great surprise, he passed me without seeming to recognize me. I turned and accosting him, asked, "What have I done that you should cut me, Mr. Rustomji?" Quoth he, "My name *is* Rustomji, Sir—Rustomji Maneckji, a merchant—lately Sheriff, but, pardon me, I don't think I ever had the pleasure of seeing your honour before!"

A short conversation ensued, wherein I was astounded to find that it was A.D. 2050. My Parsi interlocutor was the descendant of my old friend of 1873 74. "Why, Saheb!" said he, "you must have been sleeping for 176 years. How marvellous are God's ways. Does not your honour see a great change in the City? Oh! Saheb has not seen it yet! Well, then, get into my motor car at the corner there and we'll drive round the Maidan and Chowringhi." The first thing that caught my eye was an exact copy of the Jumma Masjid at Delhi of white marble: many Moslems were passing in and out, among them many ladies, all unveiled! I could scarcely believe my eyes! "Ah!" observed Mr. Rustomji, "you must be surprised, Sir. Moslem ladies in your time

were what they called *purdah nashin.* So they were, but all that folly has been abandoned for nearly three-quarters of a century." I felt that nothing could ever astonish me again, so when a splendid barouche and four dashed out of Government House compound, with a bodyguard one hundred strong, clad in scarlet and gold, I merely took off my *topee* to a handsome young Moslem in dark green uniform, bearing a remarkable resemblance to His Highness the present Nizam.

My companion salaamed reverently to this youth, who courteously returned his salute, eyeing me curiously the while. "Ah, Saheb, there goes His Majesty the Emperor to Council," cried my friend: "he is a fine young fellow, is not he ?" I faintly queried, "What Emperor ?" Mr. Rustomji rejoined "Why, the Emperor of India, saheb, of course!" This quite upset the balance of my mind. I feebly asked how I should get back to Bombay, supposing that the railways must have been destroyed. "Railways destroyed," quoth the old man. "Not much! I am going over myself to-morrow by express train by the short cut line of which I am chairman, and shall be delighted to take your honour in my private Pullman car. You see, sir, it is not quite safe to

travel by aeroplane this season. [It was May.] The air is so charged with electricity, and the upper air currents are apt to be most eccentric. Moreover, the dust-storms are very trying, otherwise I could have carried you over pleasantly in ten or twelve hours." Of course, I accepted the invitation. As we were carried across *via* Sumbalpore, Nâgpore, and Nâsik to old Bombay, the old Zoroástrian told me exactly how matters stood. I will abbreviate the marvellous tale as much as possible.

It appeared that twenty-five years previously, the British Government resolved that the time had arrived to vacate India altogether, the Natives being quite competent to govern themselves.

The first Irâdé confirmed in their posts all subordinate officials. A second announced that the land revenue system (ryotwári) of the Bombay Presidency would be gradually extended to all India under the Crown, and that compensation (to be assessed by a Royal Commission, would be paid to the Zemindars of Bengal and other landholders affected by the Irâdé. A third Irâdè abolished all inland customs, compenensation to be paid to all States affected by this Irâdé. A fourth Irâdé

imposed the penalty of death or imprisonment for life and confiscation of property on all editors found guilty of seditious writing or preaching. A fifth Irâdé proclaimed the Indian Civil Procedure, Penal, Evidence, and Forest Codes to be the laws of India.

A sixth Irâdé made English to be the official language of India.

Many other edicts followed, thoroughly completing the organization of the constitution. Lastly, was published (in six languages) a ponderous volume (edited by Sir Áhmed Belgrâmi, Secretary for Foreign Affairs), embodying Aitcheson's and subsequent treaties, and giving the text of the most important of all—an offensive and defensive treaty with Great Britain, whereby the Emperor of India and his successors bound themselves to maintain an efficient fleet to protect their coasts, and to contribute two millions sterling annually towards the British Navy; to enter into no war without Great Britain's advice; and to furnish contingents of troops of all arms for foreign service in Great or Greater Britain when need should arise. By a separate convention, the Emperor joined the British league with Japan.

It occupied all our time as we sped across Central India to Bombay to master all the details of this astounding transformation scene.

I must mention, by the way, that Ambassadors were already at all the principal cities in the world. Lord Jamsetji Jeejibhoy being the first in London, Sir Jamsetji Tata at New York, and Sir Dinshaw Petit at Paris; Ambassadors of the second class resided at Madrid, Lisbon, Brussels, Berlin, Vienna and Rome. But they were of the first class at Petersburg,[1] Brazil, Mexico, and Cairo (where the Khedive had become Sultan of Egypt, Tunis, and Morocco); Turkey in Europe was distributed between Greece and the Balkan States; Turkey in Asia was under the rule of a descendant of Ábdul Áziz; Poland was at last free; Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Iceland were ruled by a descendant of the present Danish family as Emperor of Norse Land.

Accordingly, the Prince of Wales was deputed to go out to India to announce his father's abdication of the Throne of India. A grand durbar was held at Álláhabâd at which it was unanimously resolved

[1] The Capital of Russia—as I have often reminded Journalists—is named after Peter the Great, who built it—not after Saint Peter.

that the future government should be on the oligarchical system. His Highness the Nizâm's eldest son was proclaimed first Emperor of India, and selected as his Council of Notables all the principal Máhárájahs and Nawâbs, who, however, were only to attend when convenient (unless specially summoned).

The working Council was a Panchâyat of five only; *viz.*, the Máhárájahs of Kooch Behâr, Benâres, the Nawâb of Dâcca, His Highness the Gaekwâr, and the Máhárájah of Kolhapur alternately for one year only (as representing Máhárâshtra), and the Máhárájah of Bobili (as representing Madrás), with power to add five more members should occasion arise. Unless so resolved by a majority of three to one of the Grand Council of Notables, the Imperial Office was to be hereditary.

Amid great rejoicings, all these changes were immediately carried out, and within twelve months from the date of the Imperial Proclamation, the entire British (European) army embarked for England, being replaced by Native Imperial Troops.

The seventh Irâdé gazetted the following principal appointments, *viz.*,—

The Nawâb of Dâcca to be Vizier of East Bengal and Ássâm.

The Máhárájah of Kooch Behâr to be Vizier of the rest of Bengal proper, under the title of Nawâb Nâzim.

The eldest son of the Dhuleep Singh family to be Vizier of the Punjâb.

The Máhárájah of Bhâwulpore to be Vizier of the N rth-West Provinces and Oude.

The eldest of the Nâgpor Branch of the Bhonslays to be Vizier of the Central Provinces.

The Gaekwâr to be Vizier of all Guzerâth.

The Máhárájah of Kolhapur to be Vizier of all Mahárashtra and the Southern Marátha Country.

The Nâwab of Habsân to be Vizier of the two Konkans from the River Tapti to Kumta.

His Highness the Amir of Tâlpur to be Vizier of Scinde.

The eldest son of a descendant of King Thebau to be Vizier of Burmah.

The Máhárájah of Trâvancore to be Vizier of Madrás.

It is unnecessary to give the long list of subordinate Governors. They can easily be conjectured.

I need not expatiate further on the details of these stupendous changes; but my readers will easily perceive that Germany must have been shorn of her Polish Provinces, and that France had recovered Alsace and all her territory up to the banks of the Rhine. The Hohenzollern was no longer an Emperor, but a common King with somewhat unruly subjects and no navy, that having been destroyed or captured by a combined British and Japanese Armada in the year 2,000.

I found dear old Bombay extended all over Salsette—a truly magnificent city. (Calcutta was not a patch upon it!) Sir Rustomji Bomonji Dubâsh was Governor; Sir Adámji Pirbhoy, Lord Mayor. The last census showed a population of 2,556,000 souls; the last Municipal Budget showed an income of over 2½ millions sterling, no debts, and 10 millions floating cash balance. The late Sir Jamsetji Tata's sons had carried out Mr. David Gostling's scheme for harnessing the Ghaut waterfalls; new Bombay and old streets rebuilt were constructed of steel casings filled in with cement; there had been no fire of importance for several centuries past. The

death rate was 8 per cent. ; the birth rate was 12 per cent. and increasing. I am afraid to say what the exports amounted to, lest my readers should accuse me of exaggeration ; but I really must mention that the 444½ acres of land on the Flats, reclaimed about 1880-90 with town sweepings, were converted into a magnificent public park and contained the most extensive zoological gardens in the world ; and that all the salt swamps of west and north Coorla were reclaimed up to the level of the railroad and converted into one vast meadow of succulent grasses : Chimboor and the whole of the Neat's Tongue and Karunja Islands were covered with the villas of millionaires.

I rubbed my eyes in my sleep murmuring to myself. "Can all these things be ? Is it all real ?" A melodious voice seemed to reply: "*Yes, all these things shall come to pass in God's own time.*" With that I awoke.

So mote it be ! Native readers all, may the coming year inaugurate the happy change—slow, doubtless, but sure. Khoda Hafiz ! May God make you all of a pleasant countenance! Ishwuránè sarwatrás krupa karé (may God be debonnair to you all) till we meet in the world to come.

CONCLUSION.

"A wild dream! a mad enthusiast's dream!" I hear some of my readers say—the thoughtless ones, of course. Deep thinkers, however—those among you who have studied not merely Indian History, but the History of the World—will admit that, in the main, my dream may be fulfilled as regards Ind.

Who among us doubts that the Almighty entrusted Ind to England as a sacred charge—that She should first conquer—so far as was, is, and may hereafter be necessary for His divine purposes, for the pacification of the distracted country, and the purification from its peoples from cruel superstitions—who will venture to assert that England, though guilty of many errors and not a few wrongs, has fairly obeyed the divine behest ?

We, British, know—have of late years frankly faced—the obvious dénouement—when God in his

own good time shall deem Ind ripe for the transformation; all men worth listening to in Great Britain agree that England will restore India to Indians. Many hare-brained enthusiasts and reckless radicals have striven to hasten on the transformation scene from time to time—have rung on the actors before the stage was cleared—have brought down the curtain on the footlights and caused terrible conflagrations and loss of life.

The Brahminical castes and sects—often through sheer ignorance and sinful ambition to regain the predominant position they once held in the Dark Ages—*which they will never regain*—are guilty of the great crime of delaying "*The Great Day of Restitution*—in defiance of the will of God. The Oraculœ Sybillinœ solemnly warned the World that "The mills of God grind slowly." The Priestly castes have impotently striven to make them grind rapidly by greasing them with oil of vitriol and blood—a devilish unguent! 'T is true that the great wheels have thus been made to revolve more rapidly at intervals, but the motion has then always been retrograde and retardent for a short time. "But

the mills of God," nevertheless, "grind surely" "and will exactly grind us all."

Remember this awful truth, ye sedition-mongers, and humbly abide God's will.

ARTHUR CRAWFORD.

POSTSCRIPTUM.

5th May, 1908.

I much regret that this little "*brochure*" should have been in type before the news came of the hideous murders at Mozufferpore and the discovery of the Bomb Factory in Calcutta: I should certainly have fringed this bouquet with stinging-nettles.

A. T. C.

To Prof. R. P. Karkaria
with the best compliments of the Author

2615/XX

NATIVE STATES

AND

POST-WAR REFORMS

G. R. ABHYANKER, B. A., LL. B.
Pleader, Sangli

POONA:
Printed at the Aryabhushan Press

RR. W. 11

November 1917

15218

Printed and published by Anant Vinayak Patwardhan at the
Aryabhushan Press, Budhwar Peth, Poona City.

To,

His Excellency the Right Hon'ble Baron Chelmsford,

P. C., G. M. S. I., G. C. M. G., G. M. I. E.,

The Viceroy and Governor General of India,

&

To,

The Right Hon'ble Edwin Samuel Montagu, M. P.,

The Secretary of State for India.

May it Please Your Excellency,

SIR,

I the undersigned beg to submit this note containing suggestions about the reforms pertaining to Native States after the termination of the war. Your Excellency has acknowledged in glowing terms the services rendered by Native States in the present war. The ruling chiefs and princes have risen to the full height of their imperial responsibilities and the Government of His Majesty has shown its appreciation by selecting one of the illustrious ruling chiefs to take part in the deliberations of the Imperial War Cabinet.

2. In the changed circumstances and after the undoubted assurances of their unshaken and unshakable allegiance and their splendid loyalty, the ruling chiefs and princes deserve to be elevated to the position of equal partnership in

the Empire. With a view to secure this end I have ventured to suggest

(*a*) a reorganisation of the armies of Native States;

(*b*) the providing of facilities for enlistenment in the regular army;

(*c*) the establishment of military colleges; and

(*d*) the creation of a Council of Defence to control their armies.

3. This change in the position of the ruling chiefs and princes, it is respectfully submitted, will have necessarily and as a matter of logical sequence, to be followed by considerable freedom of action being allowed to those princes, and I have suggested in the accompanying note that the restrictions under which the ruling chiefs and princes are at present labouring may be relaxed or removed, and a corresponding reform be introduced into the political and diplomatic service of Government.

4. The recent announcement of the goal of British administration by you, Sir, has evoked feelings of deep rejoicings even in Native States. The spread of education, the growing influence of the press in British India and the example of representative institutions in British India have awakened a self-consciousness in the subjects of Native States and the declaration of the policy of His Majesty's Government has kindled new hopes and aspirations in their minds. The sentiments expressed by the representatives of Indian princes in the recent Chiefs' Conference about the policy of Your Excellency's Government and the constitutional reforms which are in contemplation show the spirit in which this noble announcement is hailed by the ruling chiefs and princes of Native States.

5. Your Excellency has expressed a desire to discuss questions affecting the ruling princes, their States and their subjects. Your Excellency has also encouraged the ruling chiefs and princes to formulate their proposals for a constitutional chamber to represent the interests of Native States in matters of Imperial and joint concern and has held out hopes of an informal discussion of this subject with your, Sir, at the close of your stay in this country. I have taken the liberty to suggest in this behalf a scheme of provincial and imperial conferences of ruling chiefs and have tentatively defined the scope of the duties and functions which may be assigned to them.

6. The subjects of Native States hardly possess any constitutional rights, such as are enjoyed by British subjects. They are not associated with the administration and there are no self-governing institutions in these States. The press does not wield any appreciable influence in the territorries administared by the ruling chiefs and princes. Your Excellency's desire to discuss the questions pertaining to the subjects of Native States, it is respectfully submitted, cannot be adequately fulfilled unless some constitutional machinery is provided which will enable them to voice their feelings and sentiments. I crave permission to place the scheme of imperial and provincial conferences of the subjects of Native States, which in my humble opinion is calculated to secure this object. I have also ventured to suggest the creation of a post of an Indian political secretary with the view that he may interpret the wishes of Native States and bring to bear his intimate knowledge of the situation in the disposal of business.

7. In submitting these suggestions, I beg to assure Your Excellency and you, Sir, that my whole solicitude has been to respect the treaty rights and engagements so highly

prized by the ruling chiefs and I have suggested a scheme which will ensure the happiness and contentment of the subjects of Native States without violating in any the least degree the spirit of these treaties and which will lead to the development and growth of reform from within and will eventually bless the Native States with constitutional government.

8. I have submitted a memorandum of the chief points of this scheme, which is attached hereto as Appendix A.

9. The sagacious and courageous statesmanship and broad-minded sympathies of Your Excellency and of you, Sir, have inspired confidence in me to submit this scheme. The desire to serve in my own humble way the interests of one-fourth of the population of my countrymen in Native States is my only excuse. I, therefore, pray that Your Excellency and you, Sir, will be pleased to take into your earnest consideration these suggestions affecting an integral portion of the population of this country at a time when Your Excellency and you, Sir, are engaged in finding a solution of the question of constitutional reform in British India.

I beg to remain,
Your Excellency's and your
most obedient servant,
G. R. ABHYANKER.

NATIVE STATES

AND

POST-WAR REFORMS

—:o:—

In view of the valuable services rendered with unstinted liberality and passionate devotion by the ruling chiefs and princes and the people of Native States, it would not be unfair to expect that in the readjustment of the Empire, which is bound to take place after the war is over, they would receive adequate recognition. It is needless to state that the vast sums of money, which have been contributed by the Native States of India towards the prosecution of the war and the relief of the distress caused by it, have come from the pockets of the subjects of these States. A scheme of post-war reforms must include the betterment of the status both of the princes and the peoples of the Native States. A decoration to one ruling prince, a grant of personal salute to another or the conferring of hereditary distinctions on a third would be looked upon as simply puerile. The Native States of India have shared the burdens and borne the sacrifices as cheerfully and as willingly as the other partners of the Empire. Constitutional reformers must, therefore, necessarily include Native States in their proposals of imperial reconstruction. Ruling chiefs and princes must be recognised as equal in dignity to other partners in the Empire and the subjects of Native States must also feel a consciousness that they are an important part of the imperial fabric. But in order to have a correct appreciation of any suggestions made in this direction, it is necessary to bear in mind the present condition of ruling princes and their subjects in Native States. To an average man in British India, a ruling prince, by reason of his splen-

dour and wealth, his pomp and dignity, his historical associations, and a sense of traditional loyalty entertained towards him and regard for him as a relic of ancient greatness, is an object of reverent curiosity. He is ignorant of the constitutional position of a ruling chief in the hierarchy of the Empire. The subjects of Native States are to him a matter of supreme indifference. They have no *locus standi* in the political associations and Conferences, Congresses and Councils and even in the press. It would not, therefore, be improper to succinctly trace their present position in broad outlines. The disabilities under which the ruling princes and subjects of Native States are at present labouring, may be divided into two classes :—

(A) Disabilities imposed by the Suzerain power from a sense of self-preservation, stability and permanence of British rule.

(B) Disabiltiies which are the result of a sense of duty on the part of the paramount power towards the feudatory states. These duties are of fourfold character. (1) Those relating to a head of a Native State—namely a ruling prince or chief, (2) Those relating to the corporate body—namely the State itself, (3) Those relating to the relations between a State and a State, and, (4) Those relating to subjects of Native States.

This subject has been exhaustively dealt with by such an imperialist of the orthodox school as Sir William Lee-Warner in his book the " Protected princes of India ".

Present Position

How the policy of British Government towards the Native States changed from time to time is a matter of history with which we are not at present concerned. From the policy of the ring fence to the policy of subordinate isolation, from the grasping policy of annexation to the policy of preservation and non-intervention, and the ultimate condition of subordinate union, the evolution of Native

States during these various stages is an interesting spectacle. But it is not relevant to our purpose. Suffice it to say that all the seven hundred Native States of India acknowledge unequivocally and undoubtedly the paramount supremacy of the British Crown. They owe unswerving allegiance to the King Emperor of India and so far as matters of war, peace, external relations, and questions of foreign policy are concerned, the British Government is the controller of their destinies. In their internal affairs they are guaranteed quasi-independence. They are called sovereigns. Many writers on jurisprudence have taxed their brains to exactly define their position as "sovereign states" under the international law.

The relations of these Native States have been regulated by treaties and engagements which are nearly a century old. Great changes have taken place in the evolution of the body politic during this period. Much water has run under the bridges during this time. British rule has become deep-rooted and has become ingrained in the life of the peoplers. Peace and order in this county for over a century have entirely changed the aspect of this country and India is connected by strong ties of vested interests to the British Crown. The present titanic struggle has brought home convictions and taught lessons which would have been difficult for any experience to inculcate in ordinary circumstances. This gigantic war has shown that it is impossible for any sovereignty to prosper without the assistance of strong, well-equipped and mighty allies. The experience of the last three years has conclusively demonstrated that if there is one power more than another under whose protecting wings it would be safe to live and prosper, it is that of the British Crown. The old treaty relations, therefore, which were concluded under circumstances when order was being evolved out of disorder, when the loyalty of several states was not entirely assured, when the vestiges of old rule were not completely effaced, require considerable

modifications in the light of present day experience and the trend of political currents at this juncture.

First set of disabilities

Under the first set of disabilities, the Native States have given a blank cheque to the paramount power against their resources in the event of serious necessity; whilst as in ordinary times, some of them have undertaken, to limit their own armaments in times of peace, to pay the cost of the subsidiary forces and to maintain imperial service troops. The armies of a Native State are not to exceed in time of peace what is required for the maintenance of the reasonable dignity of the chief and enforcement of internal order. The Native States are forbidden to recruit foreign soldiers. They are prevented from maintaining fortifications. They are restricted in the manufacture and traffic of arms and ammunitions. They are not allowed to keep arms of precision and canons. The ports in the Native States are controlled by the paramount power. No foreign vessel is allowed to enter into them without the consent of the British Government. These obligations were imposed avowedly with the object of bringing about political settlement and bringing about the disarming of the people. The policy of 'mistrust' about the fidelity of Native States was mainly responsible for these obligations, as also the danger which was apprehended from the efficiency of armies in the Native States. The central idea at this time was to disband the military forces of the Native States. The idea of organising and utilising these indigenous forces in a general scheme of the defence of the Empire was never entertained. The same policy dictated a set of obligations, of the grant of rights of passage and occupation of forts to the imperial army, of rights of cantonment, of assistance in the matter of supplies, and the extradition of deserters. They also include the rights of the paramount power over the lines of communications between the forces of Imperial army scattered over the Empire and the control over the rail-

way system, the telegraph system and postal communications. As a Suzerain power, these rights were exercised for the maintenance of the imperial army. A third set of obligations deprived the Native States of their rights of negotiation and communication with one another. In all inter-statal disputes, they were bound to submit to the settlement which the paramount power may dictate. They have undertaken not to employ Europeans without the consent of the British Government, and have parted with the jurisdiction over them. It was thought at one time that if the Native States were allowed to confer with one another it may lead to a confederacy of Native States which may embarrass the safety of the established Government. The restriction about the employment of foreigners was imposed with a view to prevent these chiefs from acquiring efficiency and strength by the use of foreign knowledge, foreign culture and foreign skill.

A review of this first set of disabilities will clearly convey how illogical it is to maintain the same policy and to keep intact the treaty obligations which were justified by circumstances existing at the commencement of British rule. The whole policy has altered, the angle of vision has entirely changed now. The object at the time of the treaties was the political settlement of the country. The present policy is one of active co-operation and participation in a scheme of general defence. Distrust has given place to confidence and aloofness to active sympathy. Germs of disaffection and disintegration have died out. The awakening of the sense of common nationality, common danger, common rights, and common disabilities have cemented the ties of union. The closer association and personal contact with His Majesty the King-Emperor have generated sympathies more abiding and endurable than ties of blood, and there is a touch of personal note which is struck in the relations of Native States and the Suzerain power.

The suggestions, therefore, which I wish to make with regard to the removal of the first set of disabilities in the

altered conditions of present times are to the following effect :—

Reorganisation of Armies

(1) The armies of Native States, which are now in a moribund condition and are termed 'irregular', should be thoroughly reformed. These armies about the year 1880 were 3,49,833 men with 4,237 guns. A writer in the London *Times* bitterly complained about the vastness of these armies and the potentiality of their threatening the peace of the country. He advocated that these armies should be gradually reduced and disbanded. The policy, which was since then actively pursued, has resulted in an appreciable reduction of their numbers. In a publication styled 'Native States of India' and published in 1890, the strength of the armies of Native States is given as below:--

2,41,063 Foot-soldiers.
64,172 Cavalry.
9,390 Artillery Men.
5,252 Guns.

In a Memorandum on Native States in India published by the Government of India in 1911, the strength of this army is given as below :—

Regular troops.		Irregular troops.		Imperial Service troops.	
Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.
10526	86295	7519	43166	17028	15508

It will thus appear that about the year 1880 the total strength of the Native States army was roughly 3,50,000; while in 1911 it was roughly 1,80,000. There has been

a reduction of nearly 50 per cent. during a period of over 30 years.

But even these armies are thoroughly ineffective for fighting purposes. Mr. Sydney Low in his admirable book "A Vision of India" has graphically described the condition of this army. "We have always permitted the Native States to keep up armies of all sorts. But it was our policy that these armies should be ineffective for fighting purposes. The princes might have a limited number of men in buckram or in red or khaki coats or in mail armour to play with; but we could not afford to let these troops be made efficient enough to become dangerous. Consequently we have refused to allow the feudatories to have their regiments drilled by European officers. We do not permit them to possess batteries of breach-loading artillary and we forbid the purchase of good modern rifles. The forces of Native States were paraded for the Prince of Wale's inspections as he passed through, and some of them made a very brilliant appearance, for we exercise no veto upon the saratorial fancies of the Maharaja and if His Highness chooses to clothe his horde of military retainers armed with smooth bore musket and old Enfield carbines, in uniforms of Canary yellow or blue and silver, with old French dragoon helmets, we do not offer any objection. His subjects like the show and are pleased to see these obsolete warriors facing about and presenting arms while Colonel Gopal Singh or Major Mahamadkhan gives the word of command in what is supposed to be the English language. But to a young prince of spirit the whole affair must doubtless seem silly and theatrical and perhaps no more than a proof of humiliation and dependence. A man sprung from generations of war-like ancestors, who won their way and held it by the sword, must chafe at the restriction which binds him down to an army of stage supers and provides no worthy profession for the cadets and collateral branches of his royal house". No further comment is needed on the condition of the armies in the

Native States. They are a heavy burden to the States. The expenditure is thoroughly wasted. The armies serve no purpose at all. They do not even keep up the martial spirit of the subjects of the States and the whole concern is an unmeaning farce. If, on the other hand, abandoning the policy hitherto pursued, the Native Chiefs are allowed to train their armies in an efficient manner, if they are furnished with arms of precision, if they are drilled and disciplined in the European fashion, they will be a tower of strength in an hour of danger to the Empire. These armies can be mobilised for active service in any part of the world and would do credit to themselves and to the Empire. If, at the present juncture, the armies of Native States had been in a fighting condition, they would have relieved the anxieties of Government to a considerable extent. The first and foremost reform, therefore, which is necessary to be undertaken, is a thorough reorganisation of the armies of Native States so as to turn them into fighting units. The ruling chiefs and princes are styled comrades in arms. Their position in the Empire was declared by responsible ministers at the time of the assumption by Queen Victoria of the title of Empress of India as "civil councillors and military generals of the Empress." But unless these princes command armies disciplined, trained and armed in modern fashion, how can they be able to discharge their duties which they owe to the Empire? For what purpose is this large portion of the income of Native States squandered in maintaining an empty show? If, therefore, the money spent by the Native States in this connection is properly utilised in giving efficient training and discipline to their armies, it will give proper recompense to the States and to the subjects whose money is being thus recklessly wasted. If the term 'partners of the Empire', as applied to the ruling chiefs and princes, has any serious meaning, they must be allowed to convert their irregular troops into efficient fighting units.

This alone will justify that talk of confidence and changed angle of vision. Some 21 Native States are allowed to maintain Imperial Service Troops. Their total strength in cavalry and infantry comes approximately to 32,000. These troops are disciplined in the modern fashion. They have taken part in the actual fighting in the present war. Their services have been honourably mentioned during the present crisis on more occasions than one If, therefore, the Native States are allowed to convert all their regular and irregular troops into Imperial Service Troops, and if they are allowed to be trained in the ways of modern warfare and armed with present day weapons, how usefully and effectively would they serve the Empire? How materially, this force, if it had been properly maintained, would have added to the strength of the Empire as a whole, it is needless to speculate. The want of man-power is bitterly realised. And if wiser counsels had prevailed 30 years before, if the lessons of the Afgan War had been kept in mind, the forces of Native States would have unquestionably inspired immense confidence in the Government of India about its military preparedness at the present juncture.

The observations of an eminent Indian statesman deserve to be constantly borne in mind in this connection :—"For centuries past India has reconciled herself to the existence within its midst, of a foreign paramount power, provided that power left free scope in the shape of Native States for the ambition and independent action of the native races and provided also that the paramount power displayed by its acts complete freedom from a conceited exclusiveness in religious and political matters. The history of the Mahomedan Empire in Hindustan under the first 5 monarchs of the House of Timur, affords the best illustration of this peculiar national temperament. As long as the princes of Rajasthan lost not an iota of their authority, they loyally entered the service of the imperial court at Delhi, and as long as by their connection with the imperial court, they added to their

former dignities that of being also the Arkani Doulant i. e. the pillars of the then greatest monarchy on earth, they ensured the empire of India its proper limits. This wise and liberal policy of Akabar and Shahajahan was stupidly abandoned by Aurangazeb, who attempted to revert to the narrow, crooked and intolerent methods of Islam as interpreted by the so-called orthodox Mullas and shattered the empire to pieces in the ill-considered attempts to centralise or rather brutalise power. The whole history of the Mogal Empire in Hindusthan points to a moral, which our Government should certainly lay to heart. " The history of British India for over a period of 100 years does not supply a single instance when a Native State has betrayed the confidence reposed in it, by raising a standard of revolt, against the paramount power. In the most trying and provoking times of the mutiny, the great Native States of India loyally stood by the paramount power and voluntarily helped the British troops in restoring peace and order. The loyalty of the Native States in the Afgan troubles and the spontaneous assistance, which Native States rendered to the paramount power at that time, need not be recapitulated. It is, therefore, highly impolitic to paralyse these forces of Native States by keeping them in a moribund condition and not allowing them any scope for active service. The present strength of the irregular armies maintained by the Native States is 150 thousand strong. It is equal to the Indian troops now employed in the regular British army. Why should not Government try to utilise these vast forces instead of making extraordinary efforts to enlist recruits and form reserve depots ? Would these armies of Native States not serve as ' reserves. '? If we make a liberal allowance for the ineffective section of this army, at least ⅔ of them aggregating to one lac may be useful for active service. They have got some crude training and they are in the military line. A few months' drill and discipline under expert officers would turn these

vast forces into fighting units and can be requisitioned into active service. No one can yet predict the duration of the war. It is impossible to say when it will end. Why should not a portion of that zeal and enthusiasm now displayed by Government for recruits and reserves be devoted to reorganise these vast armies already maintained and utilise them at the present juncture? The cost of their maintenance is already borne by the Native States. If the extra cost of training, discipline, equipment of proper arms and the cost of transport to the various theatres of war is borne by Government, the native chiefs would very willingly lend these troops for the service of the Empire. But all this means transparent sincerity and genuine confidence in the loyalty of the ruling chiefs and princes. Of what avail would the talk of partnership in the Empire and comradeship in arms, be, if the paramount power is not prepared to repose confidence in the ruling chiefs and princes at this critical moment, when the safety of the whole empire is seriously involved? There was a tradition current among the Marathas that the great Madhaorao Peshawa was once asked why he did not fortify Poona, his capital city. He is reported to have said in reply that he had living walls and bastions in his great Sardars Shindya, Holkar and others and that he trusted more to living than to dead defences. How often history repeats itself! Exactly similar in spirit is the glowing encomium bestowed upon the ruling chiefs and princes by His Excellency Lord Chelmsford at the recent banquet given by the ruling chiefs at Delhi "The onslaught of our enemies may have delayed the new Delhi of brick and stone which His Majesty the King-Emperor desired to raise here, but in an assemblage such as is gathered together in Delhi to-night, do we not all feel that the war is laying foundations for the King's city far solid and more durable than the work of man's hands?"

If these noble sentiments are translated into real acts by training the vast armies of Native States into real fight-

ing units, India need not be afraid of any foreign enemy, however formidable and however resourceful he may happen to be. The Viceroy very candidly stated that the ruling chiefs and princes have identified themselves so absolutely and whole-heartedly with the cause of the empire that their loyalty is no empty formula and that they have redeemed their pledges by placing their swords and their resources at the service of their sovereign. Is it, therefore, unfair to expect that this recommendation would be favourably considered by the authorities concerned?

Enlistment

The second suggestion is that in view of the readiness and willingness of the subjects of Native States in contributing largely towards the prosecution of the war and the relief of distress caused by it and the proofs of deep and abiding loyalty given by them under the present conditions, they should be allowed to enlist as volunteers and enter the regular army. There are many disabilities under which they are labouring. Some of the subjects of Native States were not allowed to enlist in the Indian Defence Force on the ground that they belonged to the Native States. If these restrictions are removed, it would materially facilitate recruitment in the army and will help the solution of the question of man-power of the empire.

Military Colleges

The third suggestion, which it is necessary to make, is that Indian Sandhursts should be established to train the cadets of the Native States for military posts. Lord Curzon on one occasion said, "it is for this reason that by permission of His Majesty the King, I have founded the institution known as the 'Imperial Cadet Corps' where we give military education to the pick of the Indian aristocracy and which will eventuate as time goes on in the bestowal, for the first time, of commissions as British officers upon Indian Chiefs, Nobles and gentlemen". It is nearly seventeen years since the institution was started; and

during this period only 11 cadets were fortunate enough to receive the King's Commissions. The language of the commission contains such ambiguous expressions that it has stultified the objects with which these commissions were granted. The commission contained these words–' We do hereby command all Native officers and soldiers and other persons belonging to the said Native land forces to obey you as their superior officers.' These so-called Native land forces have never existed as a matter of fact. These cadets were, therefore, never employed in the regular Indian Army and they have been attached to Imperial Service Troops or to the personal staff of general officers. They have never been entrusted with regimental duties in the regular Indian army. In reply to a question by the late Mr. Gokhale, as to when these cadets would be entrusted with regimental duties, Lord Kitchener, who was then Commander-in-Chief in India, said "it is impossible to state what the prospects of these cadets are in the active services." And experience has shown during this long period that these Indian commissioned officers have been "homeless wanderers on the unattached list". The wording of the commission has been interpreted by the Commander-in-Chief to mean that however senior in service an Indian officer may be, he is always to rank as junior to all British officers in the regiments. In 1905 when the first commissions were announced, the *Times of India* wrote " hitherto Native officers' commissions have invariably ranked junior to British and under no circumstances could a Native officer command British troops. This no longer holds good, and the important change that the new departure portends will be watched with interest by many besides those directly concerned". No one could have watched the progress of the experiment without regret as the disability complained of was not removed for the next twelve years. The recent announcement in Parliament by the Secretary of State for India, regarding the grant of com-

missions to nine Indian officers in the Indian army is hailed with satisfaction by the Indian people. The reply given by the Secretary of State for India to Mr. Charles Roberts and Commander Wedgwood in this connection is not very edifying. The Right Honourable Mr. Montagu stated that nine Indian officers belonging to the Native Indian land forces were recommended for the honour of commissions. If these officers belonged to the Native Indian land forces, it meant that such forces did actually exist. And if so where are these forces ? and what has become of the commissions which were granted to these officers before these recommendations ? Is it to be supposed that these commissions have been withdrawn or cancelled ? And if so, for what reasons ? The reply also mentions that the names of these officers would be notified in the *London Gazette*. But the commissions which these 9 officers already held did contain a recital that they would be notified in the *London Gazette*. The only change that we can read in the reply is that these 9 officers already holding King's commissions would be posted to the Indian Army. So far as the rights of the people are concerned, there has not been the slightest increase in the number of appointments held by Indians. These 9 individuals did hold these posts and there has not been any addition in this respect so far as commissions in the army are concerned. They have been transferred to an existing living army from one which has been in the imaginary creation of some English statesman. It is not, therefore, correct to think that the people have got 9 posts out of the close preserves of military bureaucrats. What difference this new announcement would make in their actual status as regards rank and precedence, as compared with British military officers in the regiment remains yet to be seen. This change, it is hoped, would remove the disability, from which they suffered till now and it is a general belief that they will be qualified hereafter to command junior British officers. In fact, the whole history of the King's

commissions to Indian officers of the Imperial Cadet Corps, is of promises made to the ear and broken to the heart. I have ventured to suggest that military colleges should be established to train the Indian princes and the scions of Indian aristocracy in military science. The military correspondent of the *Times* recently advocated the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst for the general army, and the recommendation applies with special force to the training of the ruling chiefs. If, as suggested by me, the armies of the Native States are thoroughly re-organised and are made efficient fighting units, they would provide ample opportunity for these cadets to get suitable appointments worthy of their position, rank heredity and education. The present strength of the irregular army maintained by the Native States is 150 thousand strong. If properly trained, they would require at least 6000 officers. This will also relieve many States from the anxiety of providing suitable occupation for the collaterals of the ruling princes and the aristocracy and noble families in the States. The field of employment would be widened to such an extent under these circumstances, that there would not be the slightest reason for members of the Indian aristocracy to encroach upon the rights of British Indian subjects in the matter of these commissions. Discipline and training in these colleges would open careers to members of Indian nobility, awaken in them ambitions of military prowess, and kindle in them the traditional martial spirit which once distinguished their ancestors and adorned their lineage and enable them to maintain the glory of their family, the renown of their Emperor and the honour of their country.

Council of Defence

The fourth suggestion I wish to make is that a Council of defence should be created for supervising and controlling the armies of Native States. As a matter of fact the ruling princes and chiefs have no international existence. The

foreign relations are governed by the paramount power. There is no necessity for them to maintain any armies. The paramount power has undertaken to maintain internal peace and to secure them from foreign aggression. Inspite of this, the armies of Native States have continued to exist for over a century, even after the Native States were reduced to the position of vassals and had lost all international existence. The question principally is, what use to make of these armies and how to turn to the best advantage the enormous sums of money which are spent in maintaining these forces. It is evident, that the functions of these armies are purely imperial, in that they are to be at the service of the empire. Their control therefore must ultimately vest in the paramount power. The strength of these armies, the question of giving them training and discipline, their mobilisation must be determined by imperial considerations. It is therefore suggested that a Council should be formed consisting of the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, the Commander-in-Chief, the Chief of the Staff and the head of the Army Department and three ruling chiefs elected by the imperial Council of chiefs with the Viceroy at its head. This Council will determine all questions, pertaining to the efficiency of these armies and the use which is to be made of the same in the service of the Empire. The presence of Indian princes will enable them to place their point of view before responsible officers of the Empire. The subordination of the armies of Native States would remove all the apprehensions about these armies becoming a source of danger, in case they are drilled, disciplined and armed in modern fashion. These armies would certainly be maintained from the resources of the Native States, they would be officered by the cadets in Native States and would be under the direct command of the respective rulers of the several States. But they would be serving under the directions of this Council and would be subordinate to it in all military affairs. There

will be 3 members representing the Indian Civil Service in this proposed Council. The 3 Indian members, if we suppose that the Viceroy's Council would be so reformed as suggested by the joint scheme of the Congress and the Moslem League, will represent the views of British Indian subjects. The three ruling princes will represent the Native States. With the 3 military experts and the 3 European members of the Council and the Viceroy, this Council of Defence will ever contain a preponderating British element. The Council of Defence would be thoroughly representative and would be responsible to the paramount power. It will therefore be always alive to the needs of the Empire and would shape its policy in accordance with the same. The creation of a Council of Defence is deliberately suggested, with a view that there should not be the slightest room for any apprehension on the score that the armies of Native States, when reorganised, armed, trained and disciplined may be dangerous to the safety of the British Indian Empire. The supreme power of control over the armies of Native States is vested in the Council of Defence for the same purpose. If these safeguards are found to be insufficient, the ruling chiefs and princes would very willingly accept any further restrictions that may be deemed necessary after mature consideration of this subject. This Council, therefore, would enable the ruling chiefs and princes to adequately discharge the burdens of the defence of the empire and thus co-ordinate the armies of the Native States to the Imperial army. The various political officers should carry out the behests of this Council of Defence and convey its instructions to the ruling chiefs and princes. The association of the ruling chiefs and princes and the members of the aristocracy with the armies in each state would create *esprit de corps* in these troops and make them active and willing partners in a scheme of general defence.

Reform of the Political Service

The fifth suggestion which I have to make is about the reform of the political and diplomatic service. One of

the serious disabilities under which all ruling chiefs and princes are labouring is that they have no liberty to communicate with one another without the medium of political officers. The system of appointing political agents and residents is an anachronism in the present day. At the time when British rule was not completely established, these officers were purposely appointed to overawe the native chiefs and their armies. The loyalty of the Native States was considered to be of a doubtful character. British rule had not become so permanent and stable as it has become to-day. The absence of means of communications, the non-existence of the network of railways, posts and telegraphs, created insurmountable difficulties in the path of empire-building in those times. Native States had not reconciled themselves to the new order of things. The consciousness of subjection was rankling in their hearts. The humiliation of lost glory and independence was only too fresh in their minds. It was, therefore, quite indispensable at that time to maintain a large staff of political officers to keep the Native States in check, to secretly watch their tendencies and vigilantly take note of any intrigue that may be in progress at that time. The officers then chosen for this service were purely military officers and they were assisted by British troops in their work. But the situation is now entirely changed. British rule has become a settled fact. Its roots are deeply embedded in the soil. Means of communication have annihilated distance and have brought about the unification of the whole Empire. New generations of ruling chiefs and princes have sprung up from whom the past is entirely obliterated. They are brought up with the traditions of the present rule and are imbued with the solidarity of the paramount power. The allegiance of the Native States is established beyond the shadow of doubt. Community of interests has been completely demonstrated by trying circumstances like the present war. Peace and order reign supreme in the land

and the overawing influence of military officers is not only undesirable but positively irksome.

As time went on these political officers had no military duties to discharge. The only function that has remained is one of espionage. They are *functus officio*. Their only dutys now is to watch the administration in Native States. They do not take any initiative in any matters of State interest. They hear all complaints against the Native rule. They maintain stolid indifference about the well-being of the subjects of Native States. Their interference with the rule in Native States knows no laws or fixed principles. They do not care to set aside anomalies under the pretext of the non-intervention policy. They exercise their extraordinary powers of revision and correction, whenever it suits the individual freaks and fancies of any political officer. This exercise of discretion varies, as in the old days of English equity courts, with the foot of each officer. Thes ubjects cannot depend on them for ultimate redress of their grievances nor can the ruling princes depend on them for sincere and outspoken advice. Their commands under the name of advice are to be implicitly obeyed. They simply submit secret reports about the machinations, supposed or real, in the Native State and the whimsical character of the autocratic ruler. This naturally deteriorates the service as a whole and the system has since then become thoroughly objectionable. Petty interferences with the liberties of ruling princes, intolerance of the communications of ruling chiefs, *intense* and vexatious pinpricking have become the order of the day, so far as the political officers are concerned. The evil effects of this system have been severely criticised by various writers. One of the Viceroys characterised the political agents as "dangerous officials." A shrewd Indian writer has pertinently observed in his "Letters to an Indian Raja"—"it has been remarked by some one that the political officers are intended to be mentors of native princes, but that system is calculated

sometimes to make them their tormentors." Mr. Joseph Chailley in his "Problems of British India" has very clearly described the condition of the political officers, under whose guardianship, though of a benevolent character, the individuality of native chiefs and princes is entirely destroyed. He says "the political officers, who reside at these Courts, are their masters. That this may not be true in the case of the Nizam who has 11 million subjects nor perhaps in the state of Mysore with its 5 millions. The opposition of rulers of this calibre would be inconvenient and they consequently escape from the annoying control of the political despots. But elsewhere the attitude of political officer while ordinarily differential in form (though even that is sometimes lacking) is the atttiude of a servant who directs his nominal master, haughty, impolite, impertinent and ironical. And what, say the observers I am quoting, are these political officers save spies whose words will be believed by the English in the face of all out-side denial. Once they have pronounced judgment on any matter, how can the chief appeal against it save by the difficult and exceptional method of a letter to the Viceory or a complaint to the Government? "Mr. Sidney Low has also very trenchant remarks to make—" the political is not always the most tactful of human beings. The department has to fall back on a military man who has taken to civil employment or it selects a possibly second grade member of the bureaucracy. He may be fussy or pretentious or pompous or merely ignorant and idle. There are political officers to whom most of these epithets could be justifiably applied. When such an individual has to manage subtle intriguing and irritable Native princeling, at once proud, sensitive and suspicious, the machinery is not likely to work with smoothness. At the best it does run easily. The more we educate and Europeanise the native gentlemen, the less do they like being held in leading strings. The Raja feels that his brain is at least equal to that of a middle-aged, middle-class

colonel and is quite aware that this diplomatist is no body in particular when he goes back to his own country." The system therefore that has imposed such officers upon the native chiefs has created very great discontent. No doubt in the case of high political appointments selected by the India office able men are appointed. But the appointments of provincial Governments are, as remarked by Mr. Low, of the type described above. The system itself has grown antiquated. It has left no room for work of a responsible character to its officers. Their duties are merely those of spies as observed above by the disinterested French writer. The system has destroyed all individuality and originality in the native princes. It thwarts all attempts, on the part of native chiefs to improve by the association with their brother chiefs or with what is best in British India. The native chiefs are not permitted by these inquisitorial officers to assimilate what is enlightened and progressive in the free life of British India. All initiative on their part is sedulously discouraged and all their attempts to follow in the liberal footsteps of the Imperial power are looked upon with distrust and suspicion and treated with scant courtesy. Political officers are not at all held responsible for the good government of the Native States under their charge and this irresponsible position inevitably causes embarrassment to the chiefs. It does not help them in bettering their position. The working of this department is shrouded in mystery. Their reports are not open, their criticism cannot be publicly answered; they have the final word in all controversy and they are the keepers of conscience of the rulers so far as the Native States are concerned. No doubt there are some capable officers of high mental calibre and broad sympathies who outside this anamolous system would have made distinguished administrators. The chief complaint is not with the individuals, but with the system as a whole.

The most urgent reform therefore in this connection is that the political agents and residents should be entirely

deprived of their power of interference in the internal administration of the Native States. The powers of superintendence and correction which they at present arbitrarily enjoy, should be taken away from them and they should have absolutely nothing to do with the internal administration of the States. The sovereignty, though of an extremely limited character, which has been guaranteed to these Native States should be allowed to exist in its real form. The political Agents and residents should be the representatives of the Crown and should regulate only such relations as relate to the external affairs of the states.

Cardinal assumptions

It may perhaps be contended that in advocating the re-organization of the armies in Native States, the establishment of military colleges for military training and the withdrawal of powers of the political officers, is being created a new danger to the peace of the Empire. Native States, so liberalised from the thraldom of the political officers, so equipped with efficient army and so trained in military warfare, would be a threatening menace to British India. I have however made these suggestions on two cardinal assumptions. One of them is that responsible government is to be established in British India in the near future. Self-government or Home-rule has been declared to be the goal of British Indian politics. If Self-government on colonial lines is established in British India, all objections about the alien character of the rule would altogether disappear. Under a system of Self-government or Home-rule. the Government of the country would be thoroughly national. A consummation of this character so devoutly to be wished, would make it almost impossible to imagine any danger from the Native States. There would be no conflict of interests between the Government of India proper and the Native States in the event of an indigenous rule being established in British India. There is a community of civilisation, castes,

creeds, religious traditions and historical associations between the subjects of British India and Native States in India. Both of them are part and parcel of the same entity. It is therefore improbable, in the nature of circumstances, that any danger may be contemplated, from the new development of the Native States as sketched above. Even supposing that there is a possibility of this danger, of what avail would be the united strength of the Native States, in opposition to the mighty power of the renovated British India? The Native States are only one fourth of the whole of India How could one-fourth dare to measure its strength with the ¾ of this vast Indian empire? The resources of the British empire are far too great and in the altered circumstances, with the consciousness of self-governing status, the danger from Native States need not even be dreamt of. One-fourth of India will always stand by the ¾ of the Indian Empire and supplement its strength in every possible emergency. The second assumption which I have made is, that responsible government would also be established in Native States in India along with British India. The subjects of Native States are as much fitted to bear the weight of self-government as their brethren in British India. The subjects of Native States, by their traditions and experience are conversant with self-rule and they would acquit themselves of their responsibilities, if entrusted with self-governing powers to the same extent as their fellow subjects in British India would do. When, therefore, it is advocated that the Ruling chiefs and princes should be made independent of the political department in internal affairs, it is advocated in the same breath that the subjects in Native States should be endowed with the blessings of self-rule. If Home-rule or responsible rule in the real sense of the word is established in Native States, what necessity would there remain for any subject of a Native State to ventilate his grievences to any power outside the State? The possibility of making complaints against the rule of a Native prince or chief to a

foreign agency would altogether disappear. Responsible government means and does include the redress of all grievances of subjects enjoying that rule. The position of a native prince or chief would be akin to that of the British monarch, under a system of responsible government, if it is introduced into the States. And in such an eventuality no sane person would ever advocate the necessity of maintaining the institution of political agents and residents to overawe the ruling chiefs and princes. Self-government will liberate both princes and people from the annoying interference of despotic agencies and bring harmony and complete unity in the relations of the rulers and the ruled in the Native States.

A tentative measure

If, however, in the process of assimilation of Self-governing institutions, any delay would become inevitable by reason of different degrees of civilisation prevailing in 700 Native States and by reason of the unwillingness of autocratic rulers to part with powers, in favour of their subjects, the following suggestion deserves to be immediately adopted. Instead of political agents and residents exercising extraordinary powers of revision and correction, these powers should be delegated to one of the judges of the supreme Court of judicature in each province in which Native State is situated. In the case of Native States under the direct control of the Government of India, a special bench of 2 or 3 judges of the position and status of His Majesty's High Court Judges should be established. All complaints of revenue and judicial character or any claim against the ruler, for which the subjects of Native States seek redress at the hands of a political officer, should be referred to this tribunal. The disposal of such complaints by a high court judge, endowed with special powers of wide latitude, would give complete satisfaction to all the subjects in Native States. Such a judge would be above all intrigues and

would not be amenable to any influence. He would possess requisite knowledge which would enable him to dispose of all cases with a due regard to the rights of the States, to the laws and customs prevailing in these States and the rights of the subjects concerned. He will deal even-handed justice to prince and pauper alike. The bugbear of prestige would not frighten his judgement. The presence of such a court would lead to various indirect advantages. The laws in Native States would approximate more and more to those prevailing in British India. It will reform the judicial service in all the Native States. It will put a stop to all the anomalies, procrastination and the vagaries of autocratic rule prevailing in Native States. The creation of such Courts would not be derogatory to the dignity of ruling chiefs and princes. Even under the present condition a Court of redress and a Court of revision does exist. But instead of the arbitrary mandates of the political Courts, what objection would there be if the same work is done by an agency more competent, more respected and more honourable? Any self-respecting prince would prefer the decision in revision of a High-Court Judge, to the command in the name of advice, given to him by a military autocrat. Even the political officers would feel considerably relieved by such a change. To many of these Lieutenants and colonels, the work of hearing revisional applications is extremely irksome and against their grain. If they are saved from the forensic inflictions of pleaders and counsels and the harassment caused by legal subtleties and an imposing array of cases, they would think their lot very enviable. If such a proposal entails any extra cost it will be very cheerfully borne by the ruling princes and their subjects. This however is a proposal suggested as a tentative measure until full autonomous rights are conferred on the subjects of Native States and responsible Government is established in them. If however the old order of things is to be maintained intact, if the ruling chiefs and princes are to continue unbridled in their autocratic rule, if the

subjects of Native States are not to get any effective voice in the administration, if responsible Government is not to be dreamt of, it is needless to add that the political officers should not be divested of their powers of interference in the administration of Native States. Though it is seldom that these powers are used in favour of the subjects, the existence of these powers exercises a restraining influence over them in their despotic career.

I have so far dealt with the disabilities of the first class. I have suggested such remedies as I thought proper for the removal of the same.

Second set of disabilities

I shall now deal with the second set of disabilities mentioned above. These disabilities have been imposed from a sense of sovereign duties towards the Native States. The successions to the Gadis in Native States are regulated by the paramount power. During the minority of a prince, the management of a Native State is taken over by the British Government and the form of administration is also determined by it. The education to be imparted to a minor chief depends entirely on the discretion of the same power. The power of a Chief to alienate property and to encumber it beyound his lifetime is also limited. He is not allowed to own properties in British India without permission of the paramount power. His right to own private property is doubted. His power of bequeathing property is also restricted. He has to apply for leave to travel abroad and he can not communicate with his brother chiefs or carry on any negotiations with them. The grant of honours and decorations, the right to settle precedence are the prerogatives of the Crown. The acceptance of foreign orders and honours are subject to the approval of the Crown. The right to receive representatives of Native States and the right to accredit agents to the courts of Native States are controlled by the paramount power. All these disabilities relate to the head of a Native State-namely-a Ruling Prince or a Chief. As regards the corporate body, namely the State itself, there are various

limitations imposed by the sovereign power. The right of dividing and sub-dividing any State belongs to the Suzerain power. The spirit of British legislation exercises immense influence on the laws of the State. Religious toleration, the accepted creed of the paramount power is to be implicitly followed by a protected State. Laws of natural justice are required to be enforced in Native States. The jurisdiction over European British subjects, even though residing within the territory of a Native State vests in the paramount power. The extradition of offenders is ordained by the same power. The right to supress inhuman practices and offences against public morality are dictated by the same power. In the matter of currency, the gauge of railways, tariffs, tolls, patents and copyrights, the policy of the paramount power generally dominates. As regards disputes between State & State the decision entirely rests with the paramount power and such cases are generally adjudicated by political officers. The paramount power has undertaken to suppress any rebellion of the subjects in a State against the ruling prince. The paramount power reserves to itself the right to interfere in the affairs of Native States only when there is gross misgovernment, continued over a long series of years. This is probably the only condition which seems to have been imposed upon the rulers of Native States in favour of their subjects. There does not however appear any converse condition enjoining good administration in Native States on pain of deposition. The paramount power which protects the ruling princes from any rebellion or internal disorder is inclined to assist the people only when they have suffered long under a gross misrule. This implies such an imperfect sense of duty on the part of the paramount power towards the helpless subjects of the Native States, weighed down under the double despotism of their autocratic rulers and their still more autocratic overlords, that, it is, to say the least of it, thoroughly unworthy of the enlightened rule of Great Britain. The subjects of Native States who have to bear all the burdehs of the union of Native States with

the paramount power, have no *locus standi* whatsoever in the political machinery of the Empire. They have no voice and they have no hope of redress until their grivances become intolerable.

Necessity of Redress

If we consider the several disabilities, it is imperative for the paramount power to know the feelings of the Native States concerned. As regards the succession to the Gadi of a Native State, more especially when there is a dispute about it, public opinion in the State must have an opportunity of being heard, before the matter is finally decided. Government must be able to justify its action in the light of any criticism that may be passed. Similarly any inquiry about the maladministration of a ruling Chief deserves to be conducted openly and before a tribunal properly constituted. If the meanest British subject has the right to be tried in open courts, why should the same privilege be not conceded to a ruling prince. Why should his decision entirely rest in the hands of executive officers, whose judgements are likely to be coloured by the prepossessions of the man on the spot, who by his very position and the frailty of human nature is bound to take sides. If the humblest of his Majesty's subjects has the right to approach the impartial tribunal of the Privy Council why should not a ruling chief claim the right to be tried by a court, about whose impartiality he has not any just reason to complain. Similarly about the divisions and sub-divisions of jurisdictions in petty States, those who are subjected to this rule ought to be given just and fair hearing, Same considerations exist in the case of exchange of territories. The question of jurisdiction of the paramount power over European British subjects residing in Native States has been a source of bitter discontent. Why should not the ruling chiefs and their subjects have an opportunity of openly expressing the injustice which they suffer by reason of this high handed prerogative of the Crown. Disputes between State and State are "investigated secretly by the Political Agent

through whom all communications pass between the Government and the disputants, and upon whose confidentially expressed opinions the ultimate decision is based. Such a course of proceedings is open to grave abuses and considerations of general policy are confessedly allowed to weigh no less than the intrinsic merits of the case in decisions, the reasons for which are seldom made public." In all matters referred to above, the decision of the paramount power is based upon a "hole and corner" system. The remarks made by Sir David Wedderburn in 1878 hold good even at the present time. "It would not be difficult to multiply the statements of hardships suffered by protected Chiefs at the hands of Government, but it is of the very nature of the political system that such statements should be mere *exparte* complaints. As we have not access to the confidential reports of the Government agents whether or not injustice has been committed in any particular case, we cannot certainly know. But we know that all proper means were not adopted for arriving at a conclusion. Even with the best intentions and utmost care mistakes and mis-carriages of justice will occur. But the real evil of the secret system is that under it Government never can obtain credit for having made honest mistakes and the worst of motives are attributed by those who feel themselves aggrieved. Indeed one cannot help feeling astonished at the moderation of the Government, who acting as prosecutor and judge, are able to confiscate the property of an accused person without having to assign publicly any reason for so doing. Edmund Burke in one of his memorable speeches recommended, as a means of reforming Indian abuses, combination of three things, a Government by law, trial by jury, publicity in every executive and judicial concern. The experience of over a century and half confirms thoroughly this recommendation. What is at present needed in the administration of Native States is the publicity in every judicial and executive measure of the political department. A most difficult and responsible duty devolves on the so called politicals

to whom has been entrusted hitherto a conduct of peculiar relations subsisting between British Government and the Native chiefs. These politicals are called upon to act as administrators, as diplomatists and as judges controlling with greater or less authority, some 800 chiefs with some 5,50,00,000 people. Ably and faithfully their arduous duties have been discharged and no body of public servants can boast of more distinguished names than the politicals, most of whom are soldiers, but who have rather laboured to preserve peace and maintain good faith than to promote a policy of aggrandizement and annexation. Had it been otherwise, had our Indian political system been carried out by less worthy agents, it could hardly have survived until now. Neverthless the interests of justice would be safer even in the hands of inferior men conducting their inquiries in the light of day, than they can be in those of 1st class officers working without a sense of responsibility to public opinion. Open justice should be our main stay on native territory, as well as our own province and we have nothing to fear from publicity even in the political department. A secret system affords opportunities for intrigue, corruption and chicanery." No greater admirer could be found of the politicals than Sir David, but even he has to admit that the secret system of the political department should be changed and a machinery should be established, which will dispose of all questions connected with protected states in the light of day.

The remedy

The remedy for removing these disabilities is to liberalize the administrations in the Native States by giving them a position in the constitution of the Empire. This question has been under consideration for a long time and it bristles with many difficulties. There was a considerable misunderstanding on this subject. The idea of giving some voice to the Native States in the administration of British India was strongly opposed and keenly resented. There was some justification for this attitude. No Native State

ever desired to meddle with the affairs of British Indian administration. There has been considerable clearing of the ground in this connection since last year's Imperial conference. It has been made definately clear and unambiguous that Native States in India are not anxious to interfere with British India. All they claim is that matters affecting Native States should be discussed and settled in a constitutional manner and under a machinery in which they should have an effective voice. The position of Native States and their growing importance in the Body-politic has been reiterated on various occasions by eminent British statesmen. The *Times of India* has very justly observed "The Native States of India represent one third of the area of the land and one fourth of population. We could not get rid of them if we would. No one outside a lunatic asylum would suggest that the attempt should be made. Time and again, those who speak with highest authority have emphasised their place in the governance of India. Lord Curzon spoke of them as pillars of the Empire. In another notable pronouncement that great Viceroy expressed his belief in them, as living factors in the administration. Lord Minto extended the principle of state responsibility for good administration. Lord Hardinge established relations of altogether remarkable confidence and trust between himself and principal Chiefs. During this war the Native States have risen to the height of their Imperial responsibilities. In acknowledging their great and voluntary services, Lord Chelmsford said "In this war Your Highnesses have stood forth as true pillers of the Empire, and both by personal service in the field and lavish contributions in men, money and material, you have earned a place in the hearts of the British people, which will remain for all time." Yet the fact remains that having this immense stake in the Indian Empire and having done so much to justify it, the Native States are still without organic connection with the polity of India." Various attempts to create an organic connection of the Native

States with British India were made from Lord Lytton's time, but the difficulties in the solution have been so considerable that every time the efforts to give tangible shape to the idea had to be abandoned.

Chiefs' Conferences

It is therefore suggested that Conferences of Ruling Chiefs should be formed in all the provinces and there should be one Imperial Conference of the Chiefs. The present arrangement of grouping the Native States, will have to be considerably modified to suit this idea. The Native States under the direct supervision of the Government of India will have to be reclassified for this purpose. Important Native States, at whose courts special Residents are stationed, will have to remain as before under the direct control of the Government of India such as Baroda, Hyderabad, Kashmir, Mysore, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. The States under the Political agencies situated in Kabul, Baluchisthan and North-West frontier will have to be under the Government of the Punjab. Those in Tibet will have to be included within Bengal. The Rajputana and Central India States should be taken away from the Government of India. Bengal including Eastern Bengal and Assam should have a Provincial conference of the Chiefs situated in that presidency. Bombay should have a provincial conference of Chiefs situated in that Presidency. Madras also should have one. Central Provinces, United Provinces, Punjab and Burma should each have a provincial conference of Chiefs. Rajputana should have a provincial conference, as also Central India. In all there will be nine provincial conferences of Chiefs. Of course to make this scheme effective, it will be necessary to reclassify several States, on the basis of their financial condition, territorial extent, strategic and military importance, advance of education and civilization, historical importance and associations, culture of the ruling prince, progressive condition of the people, efficiency of administration and the services rendered to the Empire. Such of them as deserve

to be elevated to the position and honour of direct relations with the Government of India should be promoted to that class. The number also of the Native States, who shall be invited to the provincial conferences of the Chiefs will have to be settled, after a due regard to the importance of each State, its fitness and the necessity of its inclusion in the conference. Each provincial conference should consist of the ruling princes of such Native States as may be selected by the head of the province. It should be presided over by the head of the province in all the seven provinces. The Provincial conference of Rajputana States should be presided over by the Agent to the Governor-General, so also the provincial conference of Central Indian States should be presided over by the Agent to the Governor-General. Each provincial conference should consist of a few officials whose presence may be necessary, for information and guidance, in the conduct of business, with the Political Secretary as an ex-officio member. The object in suggesting the creation of these conferences is to give to the various ruling princes, who may be its members, an opportunity to voice their feelings. Each conference should have in it a substantial number of ruling princes and it should not in any way fetter the liberty of the ruling princes, by the inclusion of the political officers in the conference. Each provincial conference should send its representatives to the Imperial conference by a system of election. The number of members to be elected by each provincial conference will have to be determined, with a due regard to the importance of the Native States in each province and their number.

The Imperial Conference of Chiefs should consist of the chiefs of those States which have direct political relations with the Government of India and of the elected representatives of the nine Provincial Conferences of chiefs. The number of members of this conference should not exceed 50. The Imperial conference should be presided over by the Viceroy, who should be assisted by the Political Secretary and by such other officers as may be necessary for an efficient discharge of duties of this Conference.

One Sided Reform

The creation of the conferences of ruling chiefs and princes would be an altogether one sided reform. A Native State consists of a ruling chief and his subjects. The subjects of Native States have no voice in the administration of their State. They have no control over the finances, the services or the laws to be made applicable to their State. They cannot shape in any manner the general policy of the State. Administration in a Native State means roughly a machinery of collecting taxes from the subjects, who have no voice whatsoever. It has been characterised by a writer as 'an apparatus of rent-collection.' There are no self-governing institutions wielding substantial power in any of the Native States. Local self-government also is in a most backward condition. The people have no control of any kind, over the Executive of a State. The Judiciary is not independent. The press is in its infancy and does not influence in the slightest degree the administration of a Native State. The Chief or the ruling prince is all in all, virtually above all laws and above any criticism so far as subjects are concerned. If he is educated and well behaved it is a benevolent autocracy. If he is vicious or uneducated or imbecile or has morbid tastes, it is despotism of other than a benevolent character. But it is despotism in any case. The spirit of progress and enlightenment which is perceptible in British India, has not been able to leave its impress on the Native States in spite of the example of British Government being before them for over a century. Of recent years there have been some attempts to introduce representative institutions in some Native States. But all these are very feeble attempts. They are imitations or mere shadows of real representative institutions. Mr. Lovat Fraser States that "the assemblies already convoked in one or two States are mere shams and were never intended to be otherwise." The liberties which the subjects of British India at present enjoy, in the matter of Local-Self-government, Legislative Councils and Executive Councils are not extend-

ed to the subjects, of even the foremost and the socalled most 'enlightened' Native States in India. And for such a state of things there is absolutely no justification. An alien Government may plead excuse, if it is found to be relunctant to share its powers with its subjects ; for it is not familiar with the hopes and aspirations, with sentiments and feelings, with faults and prejudices of its subject population. Vested rights and self interest are great impedements in the way of liberalising the administration. The growth therefore, of democratic institutions and responsible Government is bound to be rather slow under an alien rule. The spread of education and an awakening among the subjects, will alone hasten the grant of self-governing institutions to the subjects at the hands of an alien bureaucracy. But no such considerations exist in the case of the autocratic Native Chiefs and Princes. They are familiar with the hopes and aspirations, with the sentiments and feelings of their own subjects. There is no room for conflict of interests between a ruling chief and his subjects. There are no vested rights that stand in the way of subjects of Native States and the grant of autonomous powers to them. And yet, in spite of these most favourable circumstances, what do we find in the Native States of India? Notwithstanding the fine sentiments of liberty and popular rights, which are occasionally voiced by some ruling chiefs, what are the hard facts ? Is there even one single ruling chief or prince who is prepared to introduce real self governing institutions in his State ? How many of the ruling chiefs are ready to have their privy purse separated from the resources of their own States ? How many of them are disposed to hand over the entire control of the finances of their States to the elected representatives of their subjects ? How many would choose to be guided by ministers, elected by the representatives of their subjects and enjoying their confidence ? How many would view with favour even the mere idea of a responsible government in their States ? How many would bear the

scathing criticism of their administration to their face, as is levelled in the Legislative Councils in the presence of the bureaucracy against their administration ? How many would tolerate severe rebuke for their faults at the hands of the press in their own territories ? How many have fostered the growth of newspapers in their own States ? The existence of a healthy, vigorous, dogged and an influential press is almost unknown in Native States. What opening is there of a legitimate character for the subjects of Native States to ventilate their grievances without incurring the wrath of their rulers or without exposing themselves to the risk of personal ruin ? What safe-guards exist at present for the protection of property and person against the rapacity and greed of an autocratic chief ? Under these circumstances how can the ruling chiefs and princes expect the subjects to repose implicit confidence in them as their leaders ? The ambition to become partners in the governance of the Empire is no doubt noble but it has its own responsibilities. These responsibilities include an earnest desire to move with the spirit of the times, willingness to decentralise power, readiness to bear sacrifices for the betterment of the subjects consigned to their charge, and an anxious solicitude to widen the sphere of liberties of their subjects. Unless the ruling chiefs and princes discharge these obligations satisfactorily, their claim to this exalted position would be untenable. Example is better than precept. Until therefore the native chiefs and princes by their own free will introduce self-governing institutions in the territories under their charge they cannot justly lay claim to a constitutional position in the Empire. The spirit of reform, progress and enlightenment which has been the hallmark of Briton's rule must be consciously in evidence in Native States, before they can boast of partnership in the Empire. The population of Native States is equal to one-fourth of that of the whole of India. The solicitude which is displayed by the British statesmen, by the British

public, and by the Government of His Majesty the King Emperor is not for the purpose of upholding the autocratic rule of 700 ruling chiefs and princes. The desire to ameliorate and better the condition of the dumb, helpless and unrepresented mass of these Native States, is at the bottom of the anxious consideration which is bestowed on the administration of the Native States by the Paramount Power. The paramount power should impose a condition upon every Ruling Prince or Chief, desirous to obtain a seat in the constitutional Chamber or in the Conference of Chiefs, to bring up his administration to the level of British India and an undertaking to faithfully accept and carry out the policy of His Majesty's Government recently declared. *Noblesse oblige* must exercise its sway on the ruling chiefs and princes. If they aspire for this honour of association with the suzerain power as partners of the Empire, they must, by their own examples as evidenced by their rule, show that they are alive to their responsibilities and are anxious to develop self-governing institutions with a view to establish ultimately responsible government in their States.

Condition of Subjects

The helpless condition of the subjects of Native States is undoubtedly very pitiable ; but under the despotic rule of their own chiefs and princes who are protected in their autocratic career by the strength of the paramount power, it has become quite intolerable. A writer in the *'Karnatak'* has very grapically narrated the present condition "There is no life, no real wakeful, purposeful, energetic and progressive life in States. Once famed for refuge of art and literature, they are now conspicuous for their intellectual inanition and soullessness. Among the greatest names of Modern India not even one can be claimed by Native States as its own. Our greatest politicians, public workers, historians, scientists, lawyers, orators, social reformers all belong to some part or other of British India. Three decades

ago when there was a keen rivalry between natives and outsiders for distinction in practical state-craft and when men had to act in the light of their own independent judgment and had no precedent to follow, the States were able to produce some first rate administrators and statesmen. But the conditions have changed now, and the Diwan of to-day is generally either a glorified clerk or a fussy amateur or a hardened British bureaucrat. The most promising young men are absorbed into the offices of Government where however their intelligence withers away. There is no scope for its flowering, and little talent is left in States for public works and literary pursuits." "In the Native States nobody is serious or takes his roll seriously, with the exception of few enthusiasts who provoke smiles. Everybody is playing a part. Administration, the army, the secretariat are all comedy ; no body cares for results or troubles himself about anything but appearance and the pay which it brings" is another very epigrammatical description of the present state of things given by Mr. Chailley. The so-called enlightenment and progress is nothing but an unreality and is created by, interested advertisement. The writer in the '*Karnatak*' has also very rightly pointed out the remedy for the cure of this evil. " This intellectual and moral bankruptcy will become a thing of the past only, when the people are lifted out of their torpor and listlessness, by their growing sense of their own human value and importance. Their abject and self-oblivious dependence on the all powerful *Sarkar* should make for a burning and aggressive self-consciousness, and then alone their faculties would be set free to manifest themselves of thought and of enterprise. The individual will cease to think that he is nobody in the State, and begin to feel that he has something to fight for, something to preserve, something to keep a vigil about. For has it not been said that eternal vigilence is the price of liberty. This political awakening is the necessary pre-condition of all true progress and it should therefore be the first duty of every patriot, to try

to rid the people of their present moral insensibility, miss-called contentment, and low self-satisfaction, mistaken for blessedness and to generate in them that divine discontent and that upward aspiration which is the mother of all manly idealism and effort. One way to achieve that end is to throw political responsibility on the shoulders of the people themselves and to force their pace as it were, on the path of progress." This is indeed a very correct exposition of the remedies that deserve to be adopted for the re-generation of the vast population whose destinies are at present controlled by 700 autocratic rulers. It would be well if they remember the prophetic words of Sir T. Madhavrao, that if unqualified personal and arbitrary rule continues in Native States they must inevitably collapse one after another, the event being only a question of time.

Conferences of the Subjects

For the reasons stated above the conference of ruling chiefs alone, would not be really representative of Native States. They would not represent the subjects of Native States. There is no identity of interests between the subjects and their rulers. Unless the subjects of Native States have a responsible voice in the administration, the chiefs or ruling princes cannot claim to represent the opinions of their subjects. They would be simply representing their own individual views and no civilized government would like to rely upon the opinions of a few hundred autocrats in considering problems affecting the welfare of one-fourth of the population of this vast continent. The exigencies of this situation therefore lead to the advocacy of a bicameral system so far as the Native States are concerned. We therefore propose that side by side with the conferences of chiefs there should be conferences both provincial and Imperial of the subjects of Native States. Along with provincial conferences of chiefs there should be conferences of the subjects of Native States, for the same areas. The election of subjects to these conferences shall have to be based on some

qualifications of education, property and status. These conferences should be presided over by the same heads of Governments and should be assisted by the same officials as in the case of provincial conferences of chiefs. There should also be an Imperial conference of the subjects of Native States. It should consist of such subjects as may be elected on the basis of some franchise to be determined by the paramount power from the States under the direct control of the Government of India and also of those elected by the nine provincial conferences. The Imperial Conference of subjects should like the Imperial Conference of chiefs be presided over by the Viceroy and assisted by the same officials.

Treaty rights

The creation of the conferences of subjects of Native States and their incorporation in the constitutions may perhaps be resented on the ground that it will interfere with the treaties and engagements so highly prized by the ruling chiefs. Last year at the Chiefs' Conference, a novel doctrine was propounded by His Highness the Maharaja Gaikwad to this effect "we do not desire to encroach upon the affairs of British India, any more than we want anybody outside our States to interfere with the affairs of our own States and ourselves." This proposition has been reiterated since then, by prominent ruling chiefs and also seems to have been countenanced by the representatives of the paramount power. So far as the interference in the affairs of the Native States is concerned, this proposition, when fully analysed, means that the Ruling Chiefs and Princes do not like any one to interfere in their relations with their own subjects. They want to be the sole arbiters of the destinies of their own people. This proposition presupposes that the ruling chiefs and their subjects are unfettered by any kind of limitations. It further assumes that the rights of the subjects and the Princes are adjusted

by circumstances existing in every State; that there are no external considerations which in any way circumscribe the liberties either of the ruling chiefs or their subjects. But this is not a fact. The paramount power has guaranteed the chiefs and princes complete protection from any internal rebellion and the continuance of their houses. The ruling chiefs, therefore, enjoy special protection and special privileges as against their own subjects. The subjects are not free to carry on a constitutional struggle and they cannot square their accounts with their chiefs in an undisturbed manner. The guarantee given by the supreme Government to the chiefs thus operates to the advantage of the rulers and to the prejudice of the ruled. The supreme Government is altogether independent of them both and is the most dominant and powerful of them all. If we take a hypothetical case and suppose that the subjects of a Native State depose their ruler, because he does not maintain good administration and if they do this without recourse to violence or breach of peace, would the paramount power leave the parties alone? Would they quietly look on this spectacle without in any way interfering with the parties? The reply to this would be an emphatic negative. If there be any violence or breach of peace, the paramount power may interfere on the ground that the general peace of the country may be disturbed. But if a bloodless revolution is brought about, would the paramount power be an indifferent on—looker of such a phenomenon? We have no shadow of doubt that it will come down upon the subjects with all their mighty power, crush them and restore the unhappy chief to his exalted position. This guarantee and this assurance reign supreme in the consciousness of every ruling chief in all his dealings and conduct towards his subjects. When, therefore, the paramount power so powerfully dictates and controls the relations between the ruling chiefs and their subjects, how can the ruling princes resent the interference

of the same dominant power, in their internal administration, for the betterment of their subjects. The chiefs always start with the presumption that they will receive support at the hands of the sovereign power in any conflict with their subjects, who do not enjoy any guarantees to safe-guard their interests. If the chiefs are so jealous of any interference in their internal affairs, they should be equally zealous and equally prepared to forego the special guarantee which they enjoy at the hands of the paramount power in opposition to their own subjects. If they desire to enjoy complete freedom from interference they must be prepared to rule without in any way invoking the help of the paramount power.

When the Native chiefs claim from the paramount power freedom from interference in their internal affairs, it naturally leads to the supposition that the parties to this understanding are in a position of perfect equality with each other. But can it, for a moment, be contended that the feudatory Native States and the suzerain British Government stand in this position of equality. The paramount power has enjoined in all its treaties with the chiefs and princes that they would maintain good government in their States. It has also asserted its right of interfering in the internal administration of Native States. Whenever there is gross mis-rule or incapacity to effect necessary reforms or the necessity of protecting the welfare of suffering millions, the paramount power has exercised this right on several occasions. Mr. Tupper, in his 'Indian Protectorate' has stated that so long as a ruling chief preserves peace and so long as there is reasonable security afforded to life and property and justice, administered with tolerable fairness, there is no desire to interfere on the part of the paramount power. Mr. Tupper has given certain tests when interference in the internal administration becomes imperative on the part of the paramount power. "There may, of course, be cases where the inertness of the central authority and its

callousness to the welfare of all, except the army, the court, and the priestly classes may be gradually bringing about serious mis-government. There may be no out-cry, no wide-spread discontent, no glaring iniquity but either from the idleness and incapacity of the chief or from his jealousy of other authority, there may be a complete block of business. It may be impossible to get any long and intricate case decided, because the chief either will not or cannot deal with it himself and will not allow it to be dealt with by his subordinates. There may be a slipshod style of work in all departments. The administration of justice may be slow, careless, often corrupt. At the capital we may see a veneer of civilization and a number of officials with high sounding titles of State, but five miles away from it there may be complete neglect of the most elementary requisites of efficient administration and no money may be spent on any object that is not religious or military or directly remunerative. If to neglect and suspicion be added avarice, if there be deliberate attempt to break the tenures of large classes of the peasantry, if taxes are laid upon the peasants heavier than they can bear, if without trial men are seized and imprisoned, their property confiscated, the time is at hand when forbearance towards the chief becomes a wrong to his people and when remonstrance, if unheeded, must give way to direct measures of reforms". All these incidents entirely bear on good administration in a Native State. Mr. Tupper has summed up the situation in one sentence 'the best limit to British interposition is the effectual one of good government". The paramount power, therefore, is empowered to secure good government in Native States. No doubt it is true that it has neither deposed any ruling chief for not maintaining good administration nor has it shown its displeasure by any open act of a penal character. The suzerain power has connived at Native States even when they have failed to maintian good government. There may be obvious reasons of political expedi-

ency or diplomacy for this halting attitude. The general tendency of the paramount power is to wait till there is gross misrule. Until that point is reached, a chief is not 'pulled up' as is remarked by Sir Thomas Holderness in his 'Peoples and Problems of India'. Whether such an attitude is just and proper, it is not necessary to discuss. So far, therefore, as the abstract question of principle is involved and so far as the actual practice is concerned, the treaties and engagements clearly empower the paramount power to exercise the rights of interference in the internal administration of a Native State on the ground of good government and in the interests of the subjects concerned. The claim, therefore, of the ruling princes and chiefs for complete freedom and non-intervention in their domestic affairs, is not tenable under the treaties and engagements which they so highly respect. Such a claim would be valid only in the case of real sovereign powers. The native princes enjoy not the full rights of sovereignty but only the limited rights of semi-soveriegnty with special guarantees and privileges in their favour.

The obligation of Native States to maintain good Government has been enunciated by eminent Indian Viceroys from time to time. Lord Ripon on one occasion said " it is well-known and should be everywhere understood that the British Government always entertains not only a desire for the honour and advantage of the Chiefs but also a deep solicitude for their subjects and that we measure the greatness of a State and the degree of its prosperity not so much by the brilliancy of its court or even by the power and perfection of its army as by the happiness and contentment of the people." Lord Curzon has very emphaticaly described the duties of princes and chiefs in this connection :—" It is obvious that they must keep pace with the age. They cannot dwadle behind and act as a drag upon an inevitable progress. They are links in the chain of Imperial administration. It would never do for the

British links to be strong and the Native links weak or *vice versa*. As the chain goes on lengthening and the strain put upon every part of it increases so is uniformity of quality and fibre essential. Otherwise the unsound links will snap. I, therefore, think and I lose no opportunity of impressing upon the Indian chiefs that a very clear and positive duty devolves upon them. It is not limited to the perpetuation of their dynasties or the maintenance of their *Raj*. They must not rest with keeping things going in their time. Their duty is one not of passive acceptance of an established place in the imperial system but of active and vigorous co-operation in the discharge of its onerous responsibilities When wrong things go on in British India, the light of public criticism beats fiercely upon the offending person or spot. Native States have no right to claim any immunity from the same process."[1] Lord Minto also has laid down the following dictum:-"But in guaranteeing their internal independence and in undertaking their protection against external aggressions, it naturally follows that the Imperial Government has assumed a certain degree of responsibility for the general soundness of their administration and could not consent to incur the reproach of being an indirect instrument of misrule."[2] Thus the express stipulations of the treaties and the pronouncements of British statesmen clearly establish the right of the paramount power to interfere in the internal administration of States to ensure good government for the benefit of the subjects of them.

The objection on the score of interference with the treaty rights is raised by States only when the paramount power wants to encroach upon proprietary rights or to assert certain claims which were not in existence or to throw burdens which were not previously borne by the Native States. It is only when the paramount power is actuated by such selfish motives that the cry of 'treaty rights being in danger' is generally raised and it is needless to state that under such circumstances it is perfectly justifiable. But when the paramount

power interferes in the interests of the subjects of Native States and when it is actuated by sentiments of enlightened statesmanship and broad-minded sympathies no valid objection could be taken as the motives are pure and noble.

Besides, how have the treaties been respected by both the parties to these engagements. The paramount power, whenever the exigencies of Imperial policy dictated, have twisted the wording of these treaties to suit their convenience. These treaties have never come in their way to carry out their policy throughout this long period of over a century. Mr. Cambell in his 'Modern India and its Government' has very frankly conceded this position. "It must be admitted that in our interference with the internal concerns of Native States we, do in practice go very much beyond the letter of original stipulations. But everything has shown the incompatibility of civil independence with military dependence and the force of concurring circumstances has driven us to interfere till there has grown up a prescription which settles and authorizes the practice." Mr. Campbell further advises to the following effect:-"This maintenance of forms long gone by, is false in fact, inconvenient in practice and disadvantageous in every way. It would be much better, formally to assume the feudal superiority of India and to interfere authoritativly in those things in which it is proper and expedient to interfere and to leave untouched those things which are judged proper, to be left to the inferior rulers. There would then be a uniform system and line of conduct, in stead of all the periphrasis and inconvenience of forcing some things, obtaining some things by influence and leaving some things done or undone which ought to be undone or done". This is really plain-speaking and it has correctly described the attitude of the dominant partner to the treaties. The history of the Imperial Service Troops clearly shows the respect which is given to these treaties by the paramount power. Various

Native States, which are now maintaining these troops, had standing armies of their own, lying in a most inefficient condition. Left to themselves, the chiefs and princes of these States would have turned their effete armies into Imperial Service Troops, instead of incurring additional burdens for the maintenance of these troops. Strict treaty rights ought to have induced the suzerain power not to accept the offers of these troops by the ruling chiefs. But there was the wish, the persuasion, and the encouragement of high officials of Government and the Native States immediately came forward to bear this outlay. And all this has been styled as the outcome of 'a generous and spontaneous impulse' of individual chiefs. What the meaning of 'spontaneous action' is in the language of diplomacy and political state-craft, it is needless to explain. Suffice it to say that the language of the treaties has been sufficiently elastic to suit Imperial ends. If we consider the claims put forward by the ruling chiefs and princes at the present day, they would never be countenanced by the strict words of treaty obligations. The ruling chiefs and princes are claiming a vote and voice at the annual meeting of the Imperial War Cabinet or War Conference that is to shape the Imperial policy. The expressions of intense delight at the selection of the Maharaja of Bikaner to represent the Indian Princes at the Imperial War Conference, show the great value which ruling princes and chiefs have set on the high honour conferred on one of their noble order. This is considered as the recognition of their claim to take part in the deliberations of the Council of the Empire in the matter of defence. What treaty supports such a claim? The ruling princes and chiefs are claiming the establishment of a constitutional chamber for themselves which may safe-guard their interests in matters of Imperial or joint concern. They claim to have a voice in shaping the policy of the Indian Government, in all matters which affect concurrently the interests

of British India and the Native States. What terms of the treaties, so far concluded with the Native States, would justify such a demand ? They are now holding private communications with their brother chiefs to bring about reform of their status. They are going to confer together for this purpose. What treaties warrant such actions ? The new consciousness which the ruling chiefs and princes are breathing and the new sense of self-assertion which they are manifesting and the new sense of responsibility which they entertain cannot find support in the treaties and engagements which have been antiquated. From the position of feudatories and vassals they want to be elevated to the position of equal partners of the Empire and the members of a federal union. The ruling chiefs and princes themselves by their conduct and aspirations do not want to be strictly confined to the limitations imposed by the time-worn treaties. These treaties are not a drag in their ways to claim larger rights for themselves. They only want to resort to them when their own rights are likely to be curtailed by the grant of self-governing powers to their subjects in their administrations. New ideas have sprung up, new situations have developed, new impulses are generated and the whole outlook of Indian public life has altered beyond recognition. Old relations, whether subsisting between the Indian Government and the Indian people or between the paramount power and the Native States or between the ruling princes and their subjects, must be modified, altered or even rescinded to suit the requirements of the new situation which has arisen. The terms of treaty rights must be liberally interpreted. It is not possible that any reference to existing ideas could be found in documents which were drawn up at a time, when these ideas never existed even in the imagination of the most enthusiastic visionaries in those times. Self-governing institutions, democratic ideals, association of the people with the administration and responsible government are ideas which never existed in this land when treaty rights

were concluded. *Vox populi vox dei* was not a creed so religiously respected in Indian politics in those days. It is not, therefore, wise or prudent to require the sanctity of the treaty rights to every action, which is advocated in the interests of the peoples or princes of the Native States. The paramount power wants to elevate the princes to the position of equal partners of the Empire. They have given proofs of this by the selection of one of their illustrious member to the Imperial War Cabinet and by their willingness to consider the question of giving a constitutional position to them in the Empire. Treaty rights have never dissuaded the paramount power from taking this bold step. The undoubted consciousness of suzerain power has not prevented the Government from conferring these liberal privileges on their feudatories. Why should then Native chiefs alone cling to these treaties in not liberalising their administrations, when as a matter of fact, the paramount power, which is the dominant partner, has willingly extended concessions to the ruling chiefs and princes. His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner in his speech at the Chiefs' Conference remarked:—"We rejoice at the aspirations of our fellow countrymen in British India being thus further met by the sagacious act of British statesmenship." He observed that the ruling princes rejoiced at the further accesion of strength that this pronouncement and the impending political changes will bring to His Imperial Majesty's Empire, by the enhanced loyalty, happiness and contentment of his Indian subjects. These sentiments clearly indicate that the Maharaja and those of his noble order, who are equally gifted, recognise the value of political concessions and grant of liberal rights to the subject population and the sure efficacy of such measures to ensure the happiness and contentment of the subject race. Is it too much to expect, that these foremost leaders of this noble order, would take a prominent part in initiating measures for associating their subjects with their administration and for establishing responsible govern-

ment in their own states. Such noble examples will give a great impetus to many enlightened chiefs to follow this path of progress and reform. The Maharaja himself, has admitted that no scheme for the progress of India can be regarded as satisfactory or complete, which does not take into consideration the territories of the Native States. The Maharaja insists that the scheme of reforms should include the Native States. How is the spirit of reform to permeate through the strata of Native States, unless the ruling chiefs follow in the footsteps of the paramount power and solemnly affirm their intentions to carry out this policy of reform with the same unequivocal candour as His Majesty's Government has so magnanimously and courageously done? If there is any lesson which the ruling chiefs and princes can learn from the recent announcement and from the readiness of the Secretary of State to come over this long distance at the sacrifice of time, convenience, and vital public interests, at this juncture, to confer with the leaders of Indian people, it is that they should give unreserved assurances in an open manner of their desire to implicitly follow the policy of His Majesty's Government. Such a step would be honourable to these aspiring partners of the Empire and would give intense satisfaction to the paramount power for the willing co-operation of these feudatories to help on this work of Indian regeneration from all sides.

What has been proposed in the present scheme is merely the creation of advisory bodies of the subjects of Native States. They are not clothed with any authority. They do not take away anything from the powers of ruling princes; their functions are simply to express their opinion on questions affecting their interests. It is not even suggested, that the resolutions of the conferences of subjects alone are to have a binding character upon the ruling chiefs and princes. No vested rights would be encroached upon by such conferences. They would not violate the spirit of any treaties. The right of petition and the right of expres-

sing opinions, about matters affecting their interests are the birth-rights of all subjects and we do not think that any objection to this proposal could be taken. The creation of the conferences of subjects would not immediately alter or actually affect the existing rights of any chief against his subjects. These conferences would only create a moral force, which it would be perfectly optional for each chief to obey according to his moral consciousness and his generous sympathies and noble impulses. If, therefore, the conferences succeed by their moral force, in inducing ruling chiefs and princes to follow into the footsteps of their overlords, would that in any way be considered as transgressing or infringing the sovereign rights of native chiefs in their internal administration? The bugbear, therefore, of the sacred and antiquated treaty rights being encroached upon need not frighten anybody in considering these proposals. It is in the interests of some people to draw a red herring in the shape of these treaties, to excite feelings and to pervert the vision. Some critics think that the native princes are incompetent and unfit to tackle administrative problems by reason of their want of education, culture, experience, and statesmanship and that they are not qualified to take an intelligent part in political discussions. They further believe that the ruling chiefs and princes are not the free agents and that they are under the subjection of the political officers. They fear that these princes have not sufficient nerve or moral fibre or intrepid courage to express their opinions boldly and openly. They are labouring under the apprehensions that the British Government in their solicitude to repay the obligations of the Native States would try to please them by giving the States a voice in the administration of British India and that such a result would retard all progress and would prove disastrous to the fulfilment of the aspirations so dearly cherished by the people in British India. This is principally the reason why the cry of treaty rights being in danger is raised at this juncture. But the fears of

such critics are really unfounded. Since last year it has been made definitely clear, that the native chiefs and princes have no desire to meddle with the affairs of British India and this position has been accepted by the paramount power. I have thus far tried to show that the treaty obligations do not in any way mililate against the creation of the conferences of subjects which I have suggested above.

It may perhaps be argued that as the ruling chiefs and princes are not alien in character from their subjects and there is a community of interests between the rulers and the ruled in Native States, why should the people clamour for political rights? Why should they demand responsible government? Why should they claim association with the administration? The Chiefs in their solicitude for the welfare of their subjects would maintain efficiency of administration. The ruling chiefs and princes know the wishes of their subjects and they will endeavour to rule in a manner conducive to the interests of the States. This argument is always resorted to by every autocrat, who may be thoroughly honest in his convictions. And this has been termed benevolent despotism. "Everything for the people but not through the people," is a theory which now stands wholly condemned. In European countries, though there existed community of interests between the rulers and the ruled, people have struggled for political liberty and have ultimately succeeded in getting it. Community of interests, of race, caste, colour or religion has nothing to do with the form of government. Good government could never be a substitute for self-government. Sir Satyendra Prasanna Sinha has very concisely and clearly stated that the only satisfactory form of self-government to which India aspires, cannot be anything short of what President Lincoln describedas "government of the people, for the people and by the people." Ruling chiefs only cannot take any objection to this doctrine which is now universally accepted.

The Goal

The creation of the conferences of subjects is further justified on some special grounds. The introduction and development of self-governing institutions and the establishment of responsible Government in Native States would never be accomplished, unless there is an authoritative machinery which would continuonsly work for this reform and try to bring pressure on the conferences of Chiefs by its watchfulness and by its constant hammering. The right honourable Mr. Montagu announced in Parliament that the policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord is that of increasing the association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire and that Government have decided that substantial steps in this direction shall be taken as soon as possible. Lord Islington, the Under Secretary of State for India, in his Oxford address said that in any final scheme of Indian self-government provision must be made for the Native States. He however observed that the Native States must come into the scheme of their own free will. His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala representing the Indian chiefs and princes said the other day "We welcome in this note the statesmanlike announcement of the Secretary of State and we are happy that India has in the honoured president of this evening's function a Viceroy whose political mind understands the psychology of the Indian situation and who has by his acts given proof of a sympathetic policy. India has come to be grateful to His Excellency as well as to the Right Honourable Mr. Montagu. The times indeed in which we live are too sacred for mutual strife, too momentous for mutual aspersions. The times are new, the times are great and call us all to cross the bonds of commonplace, to take up the task and the burden of to-day, to set

forth in mutual trust with bright, brave, hopeful temper as comrades in the common cause of the Empire upon the road which India must tread unhasting, unresting to join the goal." Noble sentiments, most eloquently expressed. I sincerely wish, these very sentiments pulsate the heart of every ruling prince and chief, who is called upon by Providence to wield the destinies of hundreds and thousands consigned to his care. How is it possible for each ruling prince to reach this goal? The Paramount Power cannot take any active step to force the ruling chiefs and princes to adopt this policy. The initiative in this case must come from the chiefs themselves. In the present state of things, ruling chiefs and princes are not very enthusiastic over this matter. Neither have they any ambition to move in this direction. Unless the conferences of the subjects of Native States are ushered into existence at an early date, it is impossible to achieve even the slightest progress in the direction so brilliantly outlined by the Maharaja of Patiala.

Special grounds

The creation of the conferences of subjects of Native States would afford facilities for giving expression to the aspirations and wishes of the people. The demand for autonomous institutions will come from within; it will be voiced by the subjects themselves; and as it grows in volume and intensity, it will act upon the conferences of ruling chiefs, and the chiefs under the pressure of the moral influence, will be obliged to adopt measures giving responsible Government to their subjects. The existence of these conferences will strengthen the ruling chiefs and princes in resisting any improper claims or in opposing any policy that may prejudically affect the interests of Native States. Many chiefs and princes by reason of their weakness, incapacity, cowardice, consciousness of their defects, desire to propitiate the political officers.

Personal greed, hankering after honours, fear of the frowns of political officers, will not enable some of the chiefs to fearlessly oppose any unjust burdens that may be proposed to be imposed on them, in the name of co-operation. Some have not the courage to stand up against any policy which may injuriously affect the interests of their States. The conferences of the subjects of Native States would under these circumstances prove of immense use to the ruling chiefs themselves. By reason of their detachment, freedom from the shackles of the political department and the strong incentive of self-interest, the subjects would be in a position to faithfuly and fearlessly safeguard the interests of the States.

Some Considerations

There are some considerations which should be borne in mind in this connection. A mixed conference of the subjects and princes would certainly be better and would render the whole machinery less complex. But the ruling chiefs and princes by reason of their sense of dignity, the natural distance which exists between them and the commoners in social position, by reason of the great inequality in their status, would not like to sit and rub shoulders with their subjects or with commoners in one and the same chamber. Sentiment is a great factor and plays a great part in human psychology. It cannot be altogether brushed aside in creating new institutions and in reconciling old order with new. It is therefore not possible, at least for a long time to come and until the levelling influences of democracy are in full swing, to expect a mixed conference of ruling chiefs and their subjects in one and the same chamber.

It is no doubt true, that the necessity of the conferences of subjects exists only so long as there is no identity of interests between the rulers and the ruled in Native States. When responsible Government will be established in Native States, when the voice of the people

would be respected, there would be complete harmony between the subjects and their rulers. It would not be possible then to imagine any divergence between their views. Ruling chiefs and princes can in those circumstances justly claim to represent their subjects and then they would be really called the representatives of their States. When such a state of things will be established, the conferences of the subjects of Native States would be superfluous and they may then safely be abolished. This contigency, however, is not within the range of political vision at the present moment. It is concealed in the womb of time. He would be a bold man who would predict the length of time that may have to lapse before this ideal will be reached.

It is likely that there may be a conflict of interests between the conferences of the subjects and the chiefs. But we do not think that it will be a serious obstacle. The main fight will be about the establishment of responsible Government of an autonomous type in Native States. The same unwillingness, and selfishness, which are at present exhibited by the alien beaurcroacy in British India may be shown by the indigenous autocracy of the rulers of Native States. But the lessons in Brltish India will be fresh in the minds of these rulers and they will be well-advised to extend the blessings of freedom to their subjects, who are of their kith and kin and who are passionately and devotedly attached to them. It may be, that some times, interested people may try to set up the ruling chiefs against the subjects or the subjects against the chiefs, but the folly of such a procedure will be so patent that its repetition need not be feared. The evil effects of such a suicidal policy will not take long to be detected. The growing conciousness of nationality, increasing influence of the press, higher sense of responsibility, the solidarity of political institutions and healthy development of public opinion, will discountence all such efforts and resolutely set back any such mischievous tendencies.

The conference of subjects of Native States ought to have been created long ago by the ruling chiefs themselves. They would have acted wisely if they had created representative institutions and trained their subjects in them. The existence of vigorous public opinion in their own States would have strengthened the hands of the chiefs in any demands, that they would make. Even now, when the ruling chiefs and princes are trying to secure a constitutional position for themselves, if of their own accord and by a concerted action, they bring into existence provincial conferences of the subjects of their States and also an Imperial conference of the subjects, the necessity of creating these conferences by the paramount power would immediately cease. His Excellency the Viceroy has repeatedly stated in his two addresses before the two conferences of chiefs that they should themselves deal with questions pertaining to their selves, their states and their subjects. If therefore the ruling chiefs and princes want to speak authoritatively about their States, how can they claim to do this, without first ascertaining what the subjects have to say. The Native chiefs are agitating for a constitutional position for themselves; this agitation will succeed only when they will fortify themselves by the creation of the conferences of subjects as suggested above and thus creating a strong backing of public opinion. Any neglect or unwillingness on their part to voluntarily organise such conferences would be looked upon with suspicion and distrust and their efforts to secure a constitutional position, may meet with disappointment in the absence of such a concession on their part. It is, therefore, in the interests of the Native chiefs and princes themselves, to take an initiative, in organising the conferences of their subjects, as a condition precedent to the recognition of their claim for representation in the Imperial fabric. If such a consummation is happily realised, it would not be necessary for the paramount power to move in this matter. If however, the ruling chiefs and princes are indifferent to this

matter, if they deliberately omit to safeguard the interests of their subjects, by giving them a recognised channel of expressing their own views, the paramount power by reason of its ultimate responsibility for the good administration of Native States, would be justified in creating such bodies. And in such a case, it cannot be contended that the British Government have no right to interfer with the sovereign rights of ruling chiefs. Discretion is the better part of valour and political sagacity is the better part of autocratic obstinacy. I therefore fervently hope that the ruling princes and chiefs would be alive to the needs of the situation and the prevailing sentiment of the day. I have so far dealt with the several considerations that are pertinent in connection with the system of two chambers of Native States.

Some proposed Schemes

This question is engaging the attention of some writers at the present moment and they have made certain suggestions about the Chiefs' conference. It would not be out of place to examine these schemes at this stage. A writer in the '*Karnatak*' from whom I have quoted above, does not favour the idea of a Chief's conference and he suggests that instead of the conference of ruling chiefs, a conference of Diwans should be held. His chief objection to the conferences of the ruling chiefs to deliberate on state affairs is based on the royal status, personal prestige, competency and delicacy of the political position of the ruling princes. The talk of empty dignity and the divine origin of kings is very antiquated and unsuited and unacceptable in the modern times. Experience has clearly shown and the sittings of the two conferences at Delhi have unmistakably demonstrated that there are at least 40 ruling princes who can take an intelligent interest in the deliberations of such a body and who can actively and energetically participate in its work. The assemblage at Delhi was only of a limited number of chiefs specially invited. If all the 700 chiefs were invited, we would have seen

at least a pretty fair number of the ruling chiefs taking an intelligent and active part in such deliberations. Even if all could not deliver rhetorical speeches still all would have shown sufficient understanding, to appreciate what was going on before them. Even in Legislative Councils each and every member does not deliver a harangue. Some take part in the debate, some give their opinions and some are silent spectators. What reason is there to believe that in the provincial and imperial conferences of chiefs there will not be found a decent number who will not justify the existence of such bodies? Although many of the chiefs are not blessed with sufficient education and culture and personal fitness, what would prevent them from being prepared and equipped with the necessary information about the topics to be discussed in such conferences? They can, when required, equip themselves with such information as to be able to take an intelligent part in such conferences. To depend upon the Diwans for the opinions of ruling chiefs and to treat them as their representatives would be a serious mistake. After all what are these Diwans in Native States. In some Native States the right of appointing a Diwan rests directly or indirectly with the political department. In some the approval of political officers is necessary before a Diwan is selected. In some cases he is recommended by some high government official. He panders to the whims of the politicals and often becomes an encumbrance to the chief whose salary he enjoyes. Sometimes a Diwan is the outcome of state intrigue and party politics, which are so rampant in many places. Sometimes a Diwan is thrust upon a Native State. Sometimes he is the creature of the favourite of a ruling prince. Sometimes he is chosen to be as a buffer between the ruling prince and the political department. In some States he is the holder of an hereditary Jahagir and is not expected to know anything about state-craft. In many States there are Diwans who have no education and

no qualifications whatsoever. In many places old pensioners in the British service are chosen to be Diwans who are spent-up forces and devoid of any energies. By reason of their advanced age and want of enthusiasm and vigour, it is impossible for such Diwans to initiate new measures, to handle large problems of administrative efficiency or to take a bold line of action in matters of public welfare. Being British pensioners they are apt to be guided by the frowns or smiles of a political officer. The ruling chiefs desire to take shelter behind their prestige, high position in British service and wide experience. These Diwans do not want to risk their position by giving unpalatable advice to their masters for fear of losing comfortable positions in their closing years. They make up their piles and walk away. Some ruling chiefs have a fancy for foreigners to become their Diwans. A Diwan, who is an outsider, brings in his train an influx of foreigners and all the evils akin to those of an absentee landlordism. The interests of the subjects are to him a matter of supreme indifference. He has no concern whatever with them. A ruling chief or prince cannot pull on with a spirited officer requisitioned into service by a State, unless he draws a pay far higher than what he deserves. He cannot afford to be a sychophant. Such spirited men are very few and far between and are rarely found occupying the postion of Diwans of Native States. Some chiefs have a fascination for old fossils. Some Diwans are men of no credentials. Many are chosen by their masters to serve as convenient instruments to compass their own ends. They are mere figure-heads. Through their agency many a chief engineers schemes of oppression and high-handedness by keeping himself in the background. In many States capable Diwans by reason of the vexatious interference of their overwise masters and want of freedom of action, recoil with disgust from the turmoil of the State and become indifferent on-lookers of the situation. Ruling chiefs for one reason

or another have no liking for indigenous talents though such men are earnestly devoted to the welfare of the States.

The writer in the '*Karnatak*' has himself described that the Diwan of to-day 'is generally either a glorified clerk or a fussy amateur or a hardened British Indian bureaucrat'. I have also given a description of these Diwans all over the country. There are very few capable Diwans, out of all the Diwans of 700 Native States who, by their high character, great abilities fearless independence and commanding personality, would deserve respectful hearing and honourable association. The analogy of European ambassadors and ministers is entirely fallacious. These ambassadors and ministers are not the creatures of the sweet will of autocratic sovereigns. They are selected from the public life of every nation, the traditions of which are very distinguished and the responsibilities of which are equally great. If the choice were to be between a ruling prince and his Diwan one would certainly like to rely on the original rather than on this distorted copy. The ruling chiefs with all their shortcomings have the responsibility of their position on their shoulders and in serious affairs of state politics, it would always be wise and prudent to consult the responsible chiefs rather than their irresponsible Diwans. What purpose would such Diwans serve in any discussion with them about the problems of Native States? They would shuffle all responsibility for any definite view, on the ground, that they have no instructions. A consultation with the representatives of the paramount power, then another consultation with their own chiefs, then again a fresh consultation with them would be an unending waste of time. No serious business could ever be settled through such an irresponsible agency. The writer in the '*Karnatak*' seems to have been overpowered by the illustrious example of Sir M. Vishveshwar Ayya, the distinguished Diwan of Mysore. A pure, self-less and noble personal life, high attainments, ardent desire for the welfare

of the subjects, unbounded energy, self-sacrificing efforts, transparent sincerity, vast organising power, devotion to his master—these qualities have made the career of Sir Vishweshar Ayya so eminently conspicuous. If he had the same freedom of action and if the colour-bar had not come in his way he would have risen to the top-most place in the British service. Sir Vishweswar Ayya's own example clearly demonstrates the stunting and depressing effects of an alien rule. A man of his high attainments, noble qualities, extraordinary powers would have shone resplendently in any sphere of life, and in any free and civilised country. He is an exception and an honourable exception and no generalization could be made relying on his personality. In my opinion, therefore, the ruling chiefs and princes should themselves be the members of these conferences.

Another writer in the '*Times of India*' has suggested that there should be one legislative assembly consisting of members from Native States and other Presidencies, who should discuss and settle questions concerning the whole of India such as exports, imports, army and navy. This certainly pre-supposes that the functions of the Imperial Legislative Council should be confined only to imperial problems. This has been suggested by an eminent colonial writer Mr. Lionel Curtis. Even the Imperial Legislative Assembly will have to deal with matters of legislation, that may affect the whole of British India, but not the whole of India including the Native States in India—such as those relating to stamp, registration, court fees, laws of transfer of property, laws relating to negotiable instruments and wills and various other matters. On such questions it would be necessary to have recourse to the in and out clauses of the Second Irish Home-Rule Bill of Mr. Gladstone as is remarked by '*Justice*' in one of its issues. The whole procedure would be too cumbrous to adjust itself properly. The existence of separate conferences of Native States side by side with the Imperial and Provincial councils would solve the whole

difficulty without in any way encroaching upon or interfering with the rights of British citizens. Another writer styling himself "well-wisher" has also suggested a bicameral system consisting of two conferences—one of ruling princes and another called a board of ministers consisting of the Chief Ministers or other equally high representatives of all the larger Native States. This writer does not seem to include the non-official representatives of the Native States. If they are to be included it would be exactly on the lines on which I have based my suggestions. If however this second conference, is to be of a subsidiary and ancillary character, and to consist purely of officers of Native States, where is the need of creating such a body? The chiefs themselves will represent the official view. There is nothing to prevent the chiefs from consulting their own officers and the existence of such a body and its constitutional recognition would be meaningless. The writer further suggests that there should be a mixed commission of political officers and Diwans of Native States to obviate the possibility of all conflicts and differences of opinions. I have described the average character and calibre of these Diwans. They have always to propitiate the political officers and to remain in the good books of Government. A combination of these subordinates of Native States and political officers would in all probability fetter the liberties of Native States and cause considerable embarrassment to the ruling chiefs and princes. The scheme therefore is open to this grave objection. It also advocates the existence of two chambers.

The functions of these conferences.

I shall now deal with the functions of these conferences. The subjects to be discussed should be only those which concern the Native States. Before determining the form of Government, in the case of the minority of a ruling prince, subjects of Native States, whose interests are vitally affected by this form should have an opportunity to express

their opinion. The question of the education of ruling princes is of utmost importance both to the rulers and the ruled. The character of native rule depends mainly upon the education and the culture which is given to a prince in his boyhood. Whether the education is all-sided or whether it expands the vision of the young chief or confines him in narrow grooves, is a matter of vital concern to the subjects concerned. These conferences, therefore, should have a chance to express their views about the quality of the education and the manner in which it is to be imparted to the princes. The education as at present given to a Native Chief is one-sided. It does not develop his mind and equip him with necessary knowledge. Mr. Chailley has remarked very pertinently about the Chiefs Colleges as follows. "These institutions have however been far from achieving all that was expected of them. Whether it be that the minds of the pupils were not sufficiently developed or their work not sufficiently assiduous or whether inspite of the undisputed merits of some of the best known principals, that the teaching staff was inferior, the results obtained satisfied neither the parents of the pupils nor the Government of India. It was alleged that the pupils received no solid instruction and acquired no taste for reading beyond illustrated papers and that they were only enthusiastic over Polo, Foot-ball, Cricket, Lawn-tennis, Tent-pegging and other games. Also when they returned home they speedily forgot almost all that they have been previously taught." Is it not therefore desirable that the ruling chiefs and their subjects should have a voice in the making of the rulers who are to wield the destinies of the States? Questions about the rights of Native Chiefs to hold and acquire property, to alienate and will it away, should also be open to these two conferences. Many a time vested rights of properties of subjects are in dispute. The questions of public and private property often arise. The rights of a State as a corporate body are at stake. Many a time there is a conflict between the chief on the one hand and his State on the other. Broad

lines of policy can be laid out for guidance and for protecting the interests of all the parties concerned by a free discussion of these subjects in these conferences. Questions about giving compensation for lands acquired for railway purposes, the gauge of State Railways, the management of Railway Administration in Native States, the question of the conduct of irrigation canals through Native States, the facilities to be given to the subjects of Native States to make use of such canals, the reciprocity of the laws of extradition of offenders, execution of decrees of civil courts and insolvency, questions of jurisdiction in criminal cases, questions pertaining to patents and copy-right, the question of exchange of territories, the question of jurisdiction over European British subjects residing in Native States, the treatment accorded to the emigrants from Native States must necessarily find place in the discussion of these conferences as they are intimately connected with the welfare of Native States. Attempts to bring about uniformity of legislature in Native States and in British India can be accomplished only through the medium of these bodies. The policy of religious toleration and the regard for natural justice can find encouragement and acceptance, by the opportunities which these conferences will provide for the discussion of the same. The questions of the improvement of cattle, improvement of agriculture and industries, can be conveniently made to bear good results if they are thoroughly discussed from all points of view, by the chiefs and their subjects in these conferences. Native States afford a most convenient ground for the successful experiments of agricultural improvement, industrial development, expansion of education, co-operation and village sanitation. If after a thorough discussion in these conferences, the Native States adopt measures for the improvement of these departments they would be conferring a great boon on the whole of British India. Social legislation and the advisability of its introduction will be fit subjects for discussion in these conferences.

The British Government always fights shy of embarking on this legislation, for fear of interfering with the religious susceptibilities or the domestic life of its alien subjects. These fears have no place in these conferences. The subjects and the ruling princes have no conflict of interests in these matters. If opportunities are given, for the consideration of social legislation to these conferences, they would be pioneers of reform in this direction and would successfully pave the way for introducing similar legislation in British India. Preventive legislation about the spread of epidemics, for the relief of distress caused by famine flood or fire, may be dealt with by these conferences with advantage and may lead to the wider distribution of relief by mutual co-operation.

Measures of British legislation and policy, pertaining to excise, customs, salt and opium, fiscal laws affecting the commercial services such as railways, post and telegraph and currency should be open to discussion by these conferences. The Native States contribute *pro rata* of their population to the Indian Exchequer through these sources. I have given in the appendex two extracts from articles published long ago, about the direct and indirect taxes which Native States pay to British India. It is not necessary to reproduce them here. It will however appear from them, how the Native States are justly entitled to have a voice in settling the policies and laws of British India in connection with these matters. It would not be a question of interfering with the internal administration of British India. On the contrary these conferences will strengthen and supplement the opinion of British Indian subjects in these matters. By reason of the burden which the Native States bear, their claim to express an opinion is thoroughly justified. Sir Vishweshwar Ayya, the distinguished Diwan of Mysore, has referred to this uestion in his address to the Mysore Assembly. If these conferences are created they would afford full opportunity

to the Native States to express their views, as they bear a proportionate share of the burdens, without in any way interfering with the rights of British subjects. The Maharaja of Pattiala has put the case of the Native States in a nutshell.

"It will be acknowledged that the manhood, the material resources, the intellectual energy, the courage and co-operation of the Indian States, have contributed not a little to the making and strength of the British Empire. Our soldiers fight to-day in the Empire's army for freedom, our States have their share in the up-building and strengthening of the English Government in the East. We are of the organic life of the Empire and we may reasonably claim to have a vote and a voice at the annual meetings of the Cabinet that is to shape the Imperial policy. For similar reasons we may well claim also to have a voice in shaping the policy of the Indian Government in all matters and they are many which affect concurrently, the interests of British India and the Indian States."

It will appear that in all the topics referred to above, the ruling chiefs and their subjects are both equally interested. The ruling chiefs and princes have as much a right to discuss them as their subjects. The subjects have a larger stake in the disposal of these questions and they must have an effective voice in their settlement. The creation of the conferences of subjects would alone provide this opportunity and their creation, therefore, becomes indispensable, along with the conferences of ruling chiefs and princes. These conferences of chiefs and subjects would be able to act and react on each other. Both these chambers would be complements of each other and both together would represent Native States in a real sense.

These conferences will afford material for constituting courts, for the disposal of cases of a special character. The case of a disputed succession, can very well be settled by a court

consisting of two representatives selected from the two conferences of the chiefs and subjects of the province from which such a case would come, presided over by a British judicial officer. Such a court would inspire confidence and would satisfy all the parties concerned. It will ensure an impartial, thorough and public inquiry of the disputed claim. It will not leave any room for ex-parte decision or arbitrary procedure, which generally characterises the disposal of such cases at the present time. Similarly a dispute between a State and a State can be very conveniently settled by a bench of two representatives of ruling chiefs who may be selected from the conference of the province where the disputing States are situated. Such representatives would be thoroughly competent to do justice to the case and the contending States would have the satisfaction of having their disputes settled by their own peers. The case of a ruler who is charged with mal-administration can be tried by a mixed commission, consisting of two representatives of the two conferences of chiefs and subjects and presided over by a British judicial officer. Such a court would be highly appropriate and would satisfy all the ends of justice. It will not be open to any objection and will guarantee an impartial verdict. There would be representatives of both the chiefs and subjects and being unconnected with the State or the ruling prince under trial, they would bring an open mind to bear on the situation. There is another class of cases in which the Native States who are aggrieved, have no court of redress. The claims which Native States have, against the paramount power, as regards boundaries, vested rights, properties claimed by lapse, payment of Nazarana and other haks, rights arising out of exchange of territories are decided by the executive officers of the political department. The Government in such cases is itself a party and takes upon itself the task of adjudicating the claim. In British India the humblest subject of His Majesty can sue the Secretary of State for India in a court of law. But even this privilege is denied to the civil 'councillor' and the 'noble

partner of the Empire.' Such cases can be very conveniently disposed by two representatives of the two conferences and two high judicial officers of British Government. Such a commission would be quite competent to dispose of these claims and would inspire that confidence for justice and fair play and the integrity of the tribunal which are *sine-quo-non* in the administration of justice. Thus these conferences would be a large recruiting ground for the constitution of special tribunals, necessary for the requirements of special cases. No such machinery at present exists. If this suggestion is accepted by the paramount power it would lead to the removal of an acute grievance which is bitterly resented and keenly felt by the Native States.

The Imperial conferences should discuss all the subjects which are open for discussion in the provincial conferences. The question of the defence of the Empire, the co-operation of Native States in all matters connected with this vital question, broad measures of policy to be adopted and followed in Native States and questions of all-India importance, about the rights and disabilities of Native States should be generally discussed in the Imperial conferences. The line of demarcation of these conferences should more or less be the same as that of the Provincial and Imperial councils in British India.

These bodies should be, at the outset, of an advisory character. Concurrent opinions of them both, should have a binding character subject to the veto of the Crown. Their functions should be solely limited to the discussion of questions affecting the Native States and such measures of the British Government as affect their interests and throw any obligations on them. The opinion of these bodies, about the improvement of the internal administration of Native States, about the advisability of giving them constitutions, about the introduction of responsible Government in them and about the development of self-governing institutions may be safely recommended to the Durbars of the Native States for imme-

diate acceptance, without any hesitation on the score of interfering with the internal sovereignty of these States.

I have so far tried to define the duties of these conferences. Experience would alone determine, when these bodies are actually constituted, the exact extent of the scope and the jurisdiction of these conferences. It would be presumptuous to give a cut and dry scheme at the present moment. The creation of these conferences is a stage in the evolution of Native States and as all organisms assume shape according to their inherent strength, environments, power of resistance and power of assimilation, these bodies, would properly develop if suitable opportunities are provided for their growth and progress.

Deccan address

It is very interesting to note that the idea of a chiefs' conference was prominently stated in an address presented by the Sarvajanik Sabha of Poona and called the Deccan address to Her Majesty the late Queen Victoria in 1877 at Delhi. It expressed a hope that an "effort would be made to associate the great native princes in the practical work of administration of British India and that the system of keeping political agents and military camps in native territories, will give way to more cordial association of them in the councils of the Empire, through some organization of a recognized diet or assembly, where they could meet one another and the great officers and statesmen, who rule India and discuss all Imperial questions. The time has arrived for such a change. The paramount claims of British power are unquestioned. An Imperial Government cannot be imagined without a constitution, regulating its relations with dependent sovereigns. The germs of such an assembly already exist in many Darbar gatherings, which take place from time to time. It is only necessary to legalise what is now done informally and as a matter of favour. Questions regarding the policy of small frontier-wars with barbarous tribes, boundary disputes between Native States &

similar differences between British and non-British territory, the measures to be adopted with respect to rulers who misgovern their territories, questions of adoption, extradition, coinage and of Imperial legislation might be referred to such a council." The address very wisely predicted that "the assumption of the Imperial title may be signalized by the grant of new constitutional rights to the people of the country, thereby inaugurating a new era in the gradual development of the institutions of this country, elevating its people to the political and social status of the British nation, and teaching them gradually by example and encouragement and by actual exercise of responsible power, to be manly and self-sustained, prepared to welcome their connection with England as a prvoidential arrangement, intended for their welfare and resolved to abide by it, through all troubles and trials of their mutal growth."

Forty years have elapsed since these memorable words were uttered. Has not this period of apprenticeship and leading strings been sufficient in the case of this vast country and after it has passed through troubles and trials of unprecedented magnitude, to claim responsible government both in British India and in Native States?

Indian Political Secretary.

The next suggestion is that a post of an Indian political secretary should be created in the secretariat of each provincial Government and in that of the Government of India. All work disposed of by the political department is based upon the reports of subordinate political officers. Government has not at present the advantage of knowing the views of the Native chiefs and their subjects in matters connected with them. There is not a single officer at present who can claim acquaintance with the trend of native feelings, with customs, traditions and sentiments of both the rulers and the ruled in the Native states. The decisions of Government, with all their solicitude to arrive at a correct conclu-

sion, are really speaking *ex-parte*. The other side of the shield is not seen by Government. The same reasons which have induced Government to make a breach in the ramparts of officialdom in admitting Indian members to the executive councils, apply with greater force to the case of the political department. The interests of one-fourth of the population are in its hands. It has no voice, no councils, no press, no independent judiciary to seek redress. Is it not therefore fair that there should be at least one member in the council of Government, who enjoying their confidence will represent faithfully the case from the point of view of Native States. The following observations of the Simla Correspondent of the *Bombay Chronicle* at the time when the post of a political secretary was being created deserve consideration. "Lord Hardinge is making a mistake by appointing a political secretary. It would have been better to provide the foreign office with a responsible minister outside the cabinet. This is only a question of time. I am afraid the political secretary will hardly satisfy anybody. What is urgently wanted is a better type of men for the political service.....The service though at present, good in many ways is by no means the best. Some of the old military men are good enough for the frontier work but they are not needed in Native States. A subaltern with no experience of civil administration is hardly of any use except as a dignified representative of the paramount power. The creation of the political secretary will not solve the problem of Native States. A better type of a political officer is the only thing required. The present day politicals are out of date. Quite a number of them are good ornaments in the courts of Native chiefs, but as friends and guides they are worse than useless". If not in the whole political service, at least at the fountain-head of the secretariat, there should be one officer who can lay claim to be a guide and friend of Native states, who cannot be a hidebound bureaucrat, pledged to keep up the traditional prestige of the service,

and who would impartially state both sides of the question before any matter is finally settled. I know of cases, such as the marriage of a chief, the custody of the person of his consort, the appointment of an European governess in the household of a ruling chief, grant of allowances to dowagers in ruling families, maintenance of religious and customary rites, disputes about honour and precedence, rights of subjects as against Native chiefs and many other delicate matters, in the disposal of which intense heart-burning, mortification and wounded susceptibilities have been the result. This was because the views of Native States were not authoritatively before Government and because there was no champion to advocate them in the council of Government at these times. The creation of such a post, which should be filled by a competent subject of Native States and which should be for a period of five years would be of immense use both to Government and to Native States. It would help Government in maintaining the traditions of even-handed justice to those who are under its care. It will inspire confidence and satisfaction in Native States on the ground that there will be at least one who will expound their views in the Council of the State. There is also another great advantage in making these appointments. Many a time the vagaries of the political officers require to be exposed. The scandals of the political agents acting as commission agents in some Native States have been before the public. The evil of official easements of the political department was severely criticised by the '*Times of India*' as "un-English". It once described that the political officer rides "his (Native Chief's) horses, drives his carriages, uses his cooks, shoots his big game, spends money right and left on improvements for his own luxury". How is it possible for Government to know these 'un-English' acts of their subordinates, unless there is one unconnected with the "caste prejudice" of service. Such 'un-English' acts are more visible in Native

States than in British India, because the system itself is so irresponsible, that it is bound to create 'spoilt children' of English rule. A sagacious writer has observed, "Every one must expect to reap the consequences of his actions. None can be tyrannical and thoughtless, dishonest and indifferent to the real good of those under his charge, without being himself dragged and injuriously affected by the consequences of his conduct. Man cannot even tyranise over women and children or even over dumb cattle without making himself in his turn a slave by the very force of his own actions. This is a universal principle and no crooked plans—never so cunningly devised—shall avail in any degree that may have been based in contravention of this divine law. No sane man can expect to reap anything but the whirlwind after having sown the wind and no one can expect to win confidence unless first he has given confidence. Viewed in the light of these natural truths, we are decidedly of opinion that the relations of the paramount power in India with the semi-independent Native States, as they have been hitherto carried on, by the political officers of the Government of India, whom I have advisedly called the 'spoilt children' of English rule must be re-adjusted, if the good will and gratitude of Native princes and their subjects is to be reckoned on, as an active factor in the defence of the Empire against a powerful European invader". The remedy I have suggested of appointing an Indian Political Secretary conversant with Native States affairs would go a long way in correcting many abuses that exist at present. As time goes on, the re-organisation of Native States would lead to a considerable development of work in the political department. If the conferences of ruling chiefs and subjects are created, the work of this department will grow in volume and in importance. In such a contingency it will be necessary to elevate the political secretary to the position of an Executive Council member or a responsible minister holding the port-folio of Native States. The arrangements of holding these conferen-

ces, the selection of subjects to be placed before them, the settlement of the number of their members and time of their sessions, the action to be taken on their recommendations should be relegated to this Councillor. He may not sit or vote in the ordinary legislative councils or take part in purely British Indian administration. At present the political secretary is the only highest officer under the head of government in charge of the political department. An addition of an Indian political secretary is suggested to suit the present requirments of the situation. It is needless to suggest that in making these appointments real merit would be given preference and toadies and jo-hukumwalas would not be selected, as their association with the Government is likely to bring them discredit and create unforeseen difficulties. The conferences of the subjects of Native States would enable the Government to choose the most conpicuous amongst them for these posts.

Constitution for Native States

The last suggestion which I have to make is that there should be a constitution for each Native State. By constitution, I do not mean, a written code of laws or a charter of popular liberties, for no constitution can have a binding character unless there is an authority or power to enforce it. I do not wish to propose a written constitution as was formulated for the United States of America. There is no constitution granted to British Indian subjects; but there are certain principles, certain institutions, certain pledges upon which the subject population can take their stand and defend their liberties. A distinguished writer has summarised these elements of constitution in a categorical manner. "The thorough and minute regulation and distribution of power between the higher and lower authorities in India and in England, the institution of councils and boards and corporations for deliberative purposes, the separation of civil and military, of the Executive and Judicial departments,

the necessity of legislative sanction for new taxes and new laws, the independence of the judges, the free right of petition, the toleration of all manners of opinions, and free expression of them within the limits of loyalty, the regular publication of State accounts, the equality before the law of all classes of subjects (and even of Government) the careful testing of qualifications for service in all branches, the settlement of the land and other revenues on fixed rules and the everyday increasing in-corporation and association of the people (we may now say in the Government) in legislation, in the administration of justice, and in the mangement of local affairs, these are all so many elements of our constitution, which we prize as the very breath of new life, that the Nation is breathing and lisping to learn." The first requisite in the administration of a Native State is that the Khasgi i.e. the privy purse should be separated from the revenues of the State. The civil list of the chief or ruling prince should be settled after due regard for past practice and present wants. A ruling prince or chief should not have the lattitude to increase his private property, by a policy of oppression, high handed confiscations, and arbitrary forfeitures in order to make provision for his children, other than the heir apparent and to meet his unlimited liabilities. There should be in each State a representive assembly of the people, which should be elected by the subjects. The qualifications for voters and candidates should be similar to those pertaining to the election of memebrs of provincial legislatures in British India. This assembly should have a substantial majority of elected members. It should have the power to frame and pass the State budget. It should legislate for the whole State. It should have the right to move resolultions on matters of general importance affecting the State. It should enjoy the right of interpellations and supplementary questions. It may perhaps be urged that it will be difficult to find sufficient number of enlightened public men to take part in these representative assemblies in the States. The spread of education in Native

States, the contact with their brethren in British India and the growing influence of the Press, have created consciousness of political existence amongst the subjects in all Native States. I therefore believe that it is possible to get an adequate number of men from amongst the population of every Native State, who will take an intelligent part in such assemblies and discharge their duties creditably. This objection is not a new one and is repeated every time, whenever political rights are to be confered on the subject population. This same objection was raised at the time of the expansion of Legislative Councils in British India, but experience has shown that it was baseless and that the subjects in British India have acquitted themselves creditably in the discharge of new responsibilities which they were called upon to assume. Similar objections are even now urged about the fitness of British Indian subjects for Self-government. But these objections proceed from interested quarters and their hollowness has been exposed by prominent Indian leaders. The most liberal of English statesmen, the late Mr. Gladstone, has authoritatively laid down that it is the grant of liberty alone which fits men for liberty. Unless powers are confered on the people how can they learn to exercise them. It is not therefore necessary to consider this objection at any length. There should be in every State an executive council half the strength of which, must consist of members elected by the representative assembly. The necessity of such a council is pre-eminent in a Native State. A large majority of the ruling chiefs and princes consists of illiterate, uneducated and uncultured men. They have no means of knowing the wishes of their subjects. The Press does not represent public opinion in Native States. The chiefs cannot get disinterested advice in their administration. It is only by the creation of an executive council that the welfare of the subjects can be secured and public interests can be effectively safeguarded. Even in the highly civilized and efficient

Britsh administration, with intelligent heads of Provincial administrations and with British statesmen, brought up in the traditions of English public life, occupying the positions of Governors and Viceroys, the necessity of the existence of Council government is imperatively felt. Lord Hardinge very generously and candidly described the advantages of council rule in opposition to that of one-man government. "No body can reasonably contend that with the advance of civilization entailing the discussions and solution of new questions, of ever-increasing complexity arising every day, one man government is better than Council government. The principle of Executive Council for local governments, by which the local administrations are less dependent upon the personal equation and which ensures a great continuity of policy has already taken root in India and cannot now be eradicated." If Executive Councils are indispensable in British India how much more they are needed in backward Native States. A chief with an executive council and assisted by a Legislative council should form the Government of every State. This form of administration has proved successful in British India. Why should not the Native States try this experiment ? This form was established without a paper constitution. It has been before the eyes of ruling chiefs and princes, living for years together, in close proximity with British India. The circumstances in Brtish India do not in any way differ from those that exist in Native States. There is one additional advantage, that instead of an alien bureaucracy there is an indigenous autocracy of a ruler, for whom the subjects entertain unalloyed feelings of respect and deep loyalty. As regards the services in each State they should be entirely indigenous. The statesman-like advice which Lord Hardinge gave to an Indian prince cannot be too often repeated. "Build up within your own State a body of your own subjects, on whom you can rely to serve you. Take them young, educate them, select the best, fit them for high places and

when they are fit confer high places upon them. Give them responsibility, enlist their interests and sympathy in the work of administration and I confidently predict that you will not regret the step you have taken." These words deserve to be inscribed in letters of gold in the most conspicuous place of every Native State.

With such a constitution embodied in these institutions and based on fundamental principles and with the services so trained, the administration in Native States will tend to become responsible, and the subjects will have an effective voice in the machinery of the State. I do not for a moment suggest that the paramount power should impose such a constitution on each Native State by promulgating an Imperial edict. This would certainly be interfering with the freedom in internal administration vouchsafed to the ruling chiefs and princes and so highly cherished by them. The constitution, such as I have proposed, will be evolved out of the conferences of subjects of Native States and the chiefs. The subjects will suggest, fromulate and demand the constitution in their conferences when they are created. Such demands when they would be earnerstly and intensely voiced by the subjects of Native States would act upon the ruling chiefs and princes. The sincerity of the demand and the momentum it may gather would induce the chiefs and the princes to recognise its moral force. The voice of the people so potently and so authoritatively expressed would persuade the princes to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of their subjects and nothing short of the constitution I have sketched above, would be the natural outcome of such a process. 'The generous and spontaneous impulse' of individual ruling chiefs, the force of 'neighbourly example' in British India and the 'indirect cooperation' of the paramount power will exercise powerful influence in bringing about this desired result. If however, a ruling prince or chief chooses to be autocratic, self-willed and impervious to

public opinion, the provincial and Imperial conferences of the subjects of Native States shall exercise a deterrent effect upon such a despotic chief. The advice and the fear of censure of his own brother chiefs, as expressed in their conferences, would also have a chastening effect upon such an irresponsible ruler. The flagrant disregard of the opinion of subjects and the repeated defiance of their representatives would be a topic deserving consideration at the hands of the conferences of the chiefs and subjects. The conferences would thus be able to improve the tone of administration in Native S ates and would thus help, the ruling chiefs and princes to adopt a constitution for their States. "With an enlightened and educated chief, assisted by responsible and respected ministers, with a council of officers representing all departments and the leaders of non-official classes, with the land revenue and other sources of income settled on moderate and fixed principles, with a careful separation of the Khasgi from the State department, and a proper distribution of the civil and military, judicial and executive functions, in separate hands, carefully selected from amongst the subjects of the State after due examination, with written laws and annual publication of accounts, with a policy of conservation of the rights and distinctions of Sardars and privileged classes and of a strict regard to keep up their connection with the soil, with every care taken to associate people in the work of practical administration as local justices, Panchas, Jurors, Municipal and Taluka Councillors (and we may add executive councillors etc.,), what is there to prevent the Native States from becoming models to British India, for the quiet contentment of their subjects and the great scheme of self-education and progress in political emancipation, instead of as at present in too many cases, being the source of annoyance and trouble to their own people and the paramount power and the laughing stalk of the world for utter helplessness and the most depraved volup-

tuousness." These noble words were written by the most illustrious Indian, the late Mr. Ranade, some 35 years ago. How sad and disappointing it is, that during such a long period, there has not been an appreciable change in the condition of the majority of Native States? Even to-day Mr. Ranade's remarks can fittingly be applied to all the Native chiefs with very few exceptions. The times are fast changing. It is not possible to remain fixed to old moorings. Those chiefs would certainly be wise who would anticipate the times. There is neither wisdom nor even the saving grace, when power would be wrested from the hands of autocratic rulers, by forces which they may not control. I commend the sound advice of the veteran Madras leader Dr. Sir Subramania Aiyer to our Indian chiefs and princes.

"Real concessions towards popular Government by our Feudatory Rulers cannot but entitle them to the never ending gratitude of their subjects. For, such concessions verily involve laudable sacrifice of power and wealth, of authority and patronage and of other blandishments, an inordinate love for which, invariably makes men tyrants in every sphere of life, from the positions of the heads of families to those of kings and Emperors. Every Indian Potentate, who paves the way for the substitution of limited monarchical Government, of which the noblest example is the British Crown, in place of the more or less arbitrary rule, which now prevails in most of our Indian States, will certainly rank among the great harbingers of freedom to the Motherland. Surely he cannot show his patriotism in a more direct, tangible and useful form. Such a benefactor by investing infant institutions, like the Representative Assembly in Mysore, with real power, and by making them exercise it, thereby training their subjects in the glorious art of Self-Rule, will necessarily force the hand of British administrators to act similarly within their own territory. If not for setting such example, among others, for what else

were these States saved from annihilation which overtook certain few of their kind, at the ruthless hands of Lord Dalhousie, the all-absorbing Pro-Consul of annexation fame? Such preservation of the States was surely not for the mere delectation and enjoyment of this or that single individual, to whose solemn care, High Providence has, in its infinite wisdom, willed to entrust millions and millions of his fellow-men. Of what avail is the existence of such an individual, if his heart constantly moveth not, for the uplift of these fellow-men? And with what conscience can any such person think of annexing to his name, the noblest of Aryan titles, Raja, which, by its very etymology, imposes upon him, the solemn obligation of a constant endeavour to sweeten the lives of his *so-i-disant* subjects, unless he strives hard to faithfully discharge so noble a trust? If bearing all this in mind, our Feudatory Rulers will fail to fulfil their supreme function in this respect, one may venture to say, with all deference, that Destiny will know what to do with them. The lessons to be drawn from the recent Russian events must not be altogether lost upon our Chiefs and Princes. The protecting hand of the suzerain in future, cannot but come to be used not merely in preventing oppression and misrule, but also in the constructive work of carrying out and hastening the extension of popular government steadily on, till such goal is reached throughout this Land of the Rishis."

I, therefore, sincerely implore, all the ruling chiefs and princes to take a broad review of the whole situation and to reorganise their States in the light of the spirit of freedom and liberty which is resounding in the air. The subjects may be dumb, helpless, and backward, but their whispers and murmurs are reverberating in the distant corners of the world. All honour to the chiefs and princes, who of their own accord and freewill, will undertake to liberalize their administrations, try to give an effective voice to their subjects and to establish responsible

government in their own States. The war has changed the out-look of every thing. Prince and pauper alike, must read the signs of the times and profit by them.

Before concluding my remarks, I take this opportunity of requesting my fellow-brethren in Native States to give serious consideration to this subject and to form their opinions and express them during the sojourn of the Secretary of State for India in this country. The ruling chiefs and princes are invited to frame their proposals and His Excellency the Viceroy has assured them that they would be placed before the Right Hon'ble Mr. Montagu. The chosen leaders of the people in British India, who are devoting all their energies to voice their own proposals and their own schemes, have left the subject of Native States studiously alone. They do not wish in any way to meddle with this subject and are maintaining a *laissez faire* attitude. With due deference to them, it must be stated, that this is not a fair attitude to maintain. If they would not stand up for the rights of their brethren in Native States, who else would undertake the task? With the abject and helpless condition of public opinion in Native States and with the absence in them of any Press, representative of public interests, is it possible to expect that the case of the subjects of Native States would be properly represented before the authorities? Have they not a claim on Indian statesmen? The generous contributions made to various educational institutions, to the Universities, to literary undertakings and to industrial enterprises, the encouragement given to men of letters, the patronage so liberally extended to arts and sciences, the employment given to British Indian subjects, the active assistance given to many

political organizations and the monetary help given to many politicians and public workers all belonging to British India–, by the Native States, entitle them to expect a helping hand of fellowship at this hour from Indian leaders in this matter, in which they of all others possess an expert knowledge. Indian statesmen are therefore bound to devise schemes to give effective representation to Native States in the coming readjustment. Nobody would ever suggest that they should do it to the prejudice of their own interests. But they are in duty bound to come forward and defend the rights of Native States along with their own, in the coming reconstruction. Indian leaders and their institutions have profited by the Native States and their brethren in the Native States are not sufficiently powerful to vindicate their own cause. I therefore equally and earnestly appeal to our Indian leaders, to devise proper measures for the inclusion of the Native States in a scheme of responsible Government for the whole of India.

I know this question of Native States is very delicate and thorny. On the one hand there is the policy of the paramount power based on considerations, which do not exist at the present time. There is also the reluctance on the part of Government to disturb existing arrangements. There is further the liklihood that the suzerain power may be exposed to the criticism of interfering with the vested rights of the ruling chiefs and princes in any attempt to bring about reform. On the other hand there are the treaty rights which the ruling chiefs and princes highly cherish, so far as they secure them freedom in the internal administration of their States. There are various disabilities for which

the ruling chiefs and princes keenly desire to seek redress and which they are unable to get, in the absence of any constitutional means for them to obtain this relief. The subjects of Native States have no voice and they are left in complete oblivion. They are entirely neglected in the body politic. The suggestions which I have made may appear strange and novel. But my only object in undertaking this task is to invite discussion about the scheme which I have ventured to propose. If I succeed in bringing this subject within the range of practical politics, I shall feel more than satisfied.

Appendices.

Appendix A.

Native States and Post-War Reforms.

Memorandum of the principal points of the proposed scheme.

The announcement made in the House of Commons of the goal of British Administration in India as the development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire, and the arrival of the Secretary of State for India to confer with men of all shades of opinions about the schemes of Post-War reforms have awakened intensely keen interest all over this vast continent. Lord Islington in his Oxford speech said that in any final scheme of Indian Self-Government, provision must be made for the Native States which in area and population cover one-third of the peninsula. He further observed that they must come into the scheme of their own free-will. How far this suggestion would be taken up by the Ruling Princes and Chiefs remains yet to be seen. However acting upon this suggestion and as one deeply interested in the welfare of the Native States, I beg to submit the following summary of a scheme which I wish to propose in this connection.

(1) The valuable services which the Native States have rendered during the present crisis and the unswerving and passionate loyalty which they have displayed, lead to the inevitable conclusion that the policy of distrust which characterised the relations of the paramount power towards the Native States should be relaxed and completely altered. The confidence reposed in the Native States has been enthusiastically and sincerely returned by them. The policy of keeping the armies of Native States in an effete and moribund condition deserves to be altogether abandoned.

29419

The Imperial Service troops though very limited in number belonging to some of these Native States have acquitted themselves very creditably during the present war. If the armies, regular and irregular, at present employed by Native States are thoroughly reorganised, disciplined, drilled and armed in the modern fashion, they would be a tower of strength to the Empire. The resources of the Native States are now frittered away in keeping up a vain show. They would be turned to good account if they are spent in maintaining these forces in a fighting condition.

(2) The second suggestion is that in view of the readiness and willingness of the subjects of the Native States in contributing largely towards the prosecution of the war and the relief of distress caused by it and proofs of deep and abiding loyalty given by them under the present trying conditions, they should be allowed to enlist as volunteers and enter the regular army. This would materially facilitate recruitment in the army and will help the solution of the question of man power of the Empire.

(3) The third suggestion is that Military Colleges should be established to give training to cadets of Native States, to Collaterals of the Ruling Chiefs and Princes and to the members of the Indian aristocracy and gentry. If the armies of the Native States are reformed and are turned into fighting units, they would require a large number of officers. They would offer vast opportunities of military employments to the Ruling Cadets and the nobility in Native States. This reform will also relieve many Ruling Princes and Chiefs from the anxieties of finding suitable occupation to the members of their fraternity.

(4) The fourth suggestion is that a Council of Defence should be established consisting of the members of the Executive Council of the Viceroy, the Commander-in-Chief, the Chief of the Staff, the Head of the Army Department, three Ruling Chiefs, with the Viceroy at its head. This Council should determine all questions about the strength, training, discipline and equipment of the forces of Native States. The armies of Native States officered by their nobility and commanded by their Ruling Princes are to serve

under the directions of this Council. They should be entirely under the control of this Council. The creation of this Council and its control of the forces of Native States would make it impossible for these forces to become a source of danger to the Empire and threaten the peace of British India at any time.

The above suggestions are made on the cardinal assumption viz. that responsible Government of an autonomous character would be soon established in British India. Self-Government or Home Rule would remove the alien character of British rule. The Government would become thoroughly national and in such an eventuality there would be no room for conflict of interests between Native States and British India.

(5) The fifth suggestion is that the Political and diplomatic service should be thoroughly revised. The institution f keeping Political Officers at the Courts of Native States to overawe their administrations has become out of date. The loyalty of Native States is completely assured. The elements of disaffection and strife have disappeared long ago. There is no necessity of keeping military officers any longer in these posts. The political officers are not responsible for the good administration of the Native States entrusted to their charge. They cannot interfere by reason of the non-intervention policy. They, however, have to hear complaints of all sorts against the Native rule. Their intervention knows no fixed rules based on any principle. Their position has become very anamolous. It is, therefore, suggested that the powers of revision, correction and advice now exercised by these officers in the internal administration of Natives States and on the applications of the subjects of the Native States against their Rulers, should be taken away from them. Their duties should be limited to the external affairs of the States. This suggestion has been made on the assumption that responsible Government of an autonomous type should be established in Native States on the lines adopted in British India. If responsible Government is established in Native States, there would be absolutely no necessity for any subject of Native State to seek

redress for any grievance at the hands of a foreign agency like that of a political officer.

(6) The sixth suggestion is that if, by reason of the backward condition of some Native States and the unwillingness of Ruling Chiefs to establish responsible government in their States and the unavoidable delay in the assimilation of self-governing institutions, the present order of things is to continue any longer, a tentative measure is suggested for immediate adoption. The powers of supervision and correction now exercised by the political officers on the applications of the subjects of Native States against their Rulers should be handed over to a judge of the court of the highest judicature in every Province within whose territorial jurisdiction the Native States are situated. In the case of the Native States under the direct control of the Government of India, a Bench of two or three judges of the position and standing of High Court Judges should be established for the same purpose. This system will give entire satisfaction to the subjects of Native States. Ruling Princes and Chiefs would certainly accept, with greater alacrity, the decisions in revision of such Judges rather than the arbitrary commands in the name of advice of the political officers. The political officers also, who are generally military men, would welcome this change as a great relief.

(7) The seventh suggestion is about the formation of the Conferences of Ruling Chiefs and Princes and the subjects of Native States. The Ruling Chiefs, and Princes are not allowed to communicate with one another or to consult and deliberate on matters affecting their interests. They have no position in the constitution of the Empire. The subjects of the Native States have no *locus-standi* whatsoever in the administration of this country. It is therefore, suggested :—

(*a*) that an Imperial Conference of Ruling Chiefs and Princes should be established similar to the Imperial Legislative Council. All Chiefs, at whose Courts Political Residents are stationed like Baroda, Hyderabad, Kashmir, Mysore, Nepal,

Bhutan, Sikim, should be included in it, with such representatives as are elected by the Provincial Conferences of Ruling Chiefs.

(*b*) There should be Provincial Conferences of Ruling Chiefs for United Bengal, for the Presidency of Bombay, for the Presidency of Madras, for Central Provinces, for the Punjab, for the United Provinces, for Central India, for Rajputana and for Burma, in all nine. The States now under the Government of India such as those of the North-West Frontier, Baluchistan and Afghanistan should be included in the Punjab for this purpose. Tibet may be included under United Bengal. Central India States and Rajputana should be separated from the Government of India for this purpose.

The Imperial Conference should be presided over by the Viceroy and should also include some officials selected by the Viceroy to assist in the deliberations. Out of the nine Provincial Conferences, seven should be presided over by the Heads of Provincial Governments and should include such officials appointed by these Heads of Provinces for the conduct of the business. The two Provincial Conferences of Central India and Rajputana should be presided over by the Agents to the Governor-General in those two Agencies. Subjects to be discussed by these Conferences should mainly relate to the Native States concerned. All questions about the defence of the Empire, about the co-operation of Native States in this connection, about the laws to be introduced in Native States should be considered by these Conferences. Measures of British Legislation and British policy, which affect the interests of the subjects of Native States along with those of British India, should also be submitted for the consideration of these Conferences. The Imperial Chiefs' Conference may be of considerable use in selecting members to the future Imperial War Conferences The creation of Chiefs' Conferences would be an entirely one-sided reform. The Ruling Princes and Chiefs are thoroughly autocratic. In none of the Native States, self-governing

institutions of a genuine character are introduced. The subjects of Native States have no control over their revenues, over the services and they cannot in the smallest degree shape the policy or the laws of their States. There is, therefore, no identity of interests between the subjects of Native States and their Rulers. A Native State includes both its Ruling Chief and its subjects. Unless, therefore, the Chief is really a representative of the interests of his subjects, mere reliance on autocratic Rulers for the opinions of subjects concerned would be unjust and unfair. Unless responsible Government is established in Native States, the Ruling Chiefs cannot claim to represent their subjects. Solicitude, which is at present evinced for the well-being of one-fourth of the population of the whole of India by the Paramount Power, is not merely a regard for a few hundred autocrats, but implies the desire to better the status and position of this dumb, helpless and unrepresented mass. In a scheme, therefore, of self-government and responsible administration, the subjects of Native States must find a place. It is, therefore, proposed that along with the Chiefs conferences, there should be Conferences of the subjects of Native States for the same areas. The selection of subjects to these Conferences should depend upon some rules based on education, property and status. They should also be presided over like the Chiefs' Conference by the same authorities and should be assisted by the same officials. The topics to be discussed should also be identical Subjects of Native States are as much interested and as much entitled as the Ruling Chiefs to discuss, for instance, questions like the forms of administration in a minority, the education that should be given to their Rulers, the improvement of agriculture and commerce, the reciprocity of Insolvency and Extradition Laws, the question of compensation of lands acquired for Railway purposes, the improvement of cattle and many others. These two chambers, one of the Ruling Princes and one of their subjects, would act and react on each other and would materially advance the interests of them both. Some very difficult and very delicate questions such as disputed successions, rights between State and State or the trial of a Chief for maladministration can

be conveniently decided by a mixed committee of both these Chambers presided over by a British Judicial Officer. The dispute about the rights of Native States against the Paramount Power may also be decided by a mixed commission consisting of two representatives of these Conferences and two high Judicial Officers of the British Government. This will greatly relieve the paramount Power of an amount of unpleasantness and awkwardness in handling these cases, The creation and development of self-governing institutions in Native States will never advance unless these popular Chambers of the subjects of Native States are created side by side with those of Ruling Princes. The creation of these popular Chambers in furtherance of these objects would save the Paramount Power from the criticism of interfering with the sovereignty of Native States and their Treaty obligations.

These bodies should at the outset be of an advisory character. Concurrent opinions of them both should have a binding character subject to the veto of the Crown. Their functions should be solely limited to the discussions of questions affecting the Native States only and such measures of the British Government as affect their interests and throw any obligations on them.

This bi-cameral system is suggested with the sole object of securing effective representation of the two component parts of the Native States ; viz. the Ruling Princes and their subjects in any organic union that may be brought about in the near future. There are four considerations to be borne in mind in judging of this bi-cameral system.

(1) Ruling Princes, by reason of their notions of dignity, would not like to sit with the commoners of their State in one and the same Chamber. If this had been possible, it would not have been necessary to suggest two Chambers.

(2) When Ruling Princes give responsible Government to their subjects, they would be really representatives of them and in such a contingency the Conferences of the subjects of Native States would become superfluous and may be abolished.

(3) These two organisations are intended to become the compliments of each other. They should not play in the hands of interested persons to stifle each other.

(4) If Native Princes want to pose as the leaders and spokesmen of their subjects, they should, of their own free-will and by a concerted action on their own part, bring into existence such bodies to ensure responsible hearing to their demands. If they take this initiative, it would not be necessary for the Paramount Power to create them. If, however, they fail to do this, they cannot claim to represent their subjects and the creation of these Conferences of subjects of Native States should become imperative.

(8) The eighth suggestion is that there should be a Secretary to the Political Department holding appointment for a fixed period and selected from the subjects of Native States, in the Secretariat of each Provincial Government and one in the Secretariat of the Government of India. All matters disposed of in the Political Department in an executive capacity and affecting the interests of Native States should in the first place pass through the hands of this Officer, who should represent the views of the Ruling Chiefs and Princes and of their subjects. At present neither the Imperial Government nor the Provincial Government has the advantage of knowing the views of Native States from one, who can claim acquaintance with them. Government has simply to rely upon the *exparte* reports of the Political Officers in deciding all questions disposed of by the Political Department. As time advances, the suggested reorganisation of the Native States would lead to a vast development of work of this Department, which would increase both in volume and in importance. The position of Political Secretary should, in these circumstances, be elevated to that of a member of the Executive Council holding the portfolio of Native States.

(9) The ninth suggestion is that there should be a constitution in each Native State. It should make it obligatory on each Ruling Prince to determine and separate his Khasgi

or Civil list from the income of the State; it should enjoin the Chief to create a Representative Assembly for his State with powers analogous to those of the Provincial Council in British India. It should compel the Ruling Chief to constitute an Executive Council, half the members of which must be elected by the Representative Assembly of the State. The position of a Ruling Chief under these circumstances would be like that of the Head of a Province with a large Civil list and with a right to command the forces if they exist. The subjects shall have a responsible voice in the administration. Such a constitution would enure to the benefit of both the Rulers and the ruled in a Native State. The creation of the Conferences of the subjects of Native States and those of the Ruling Princes under the guidance the of Paramount Power would alone lead to this happy consummation.

Appendix B.

Extract from articles contributed by the present writer to the Mahratta.

I

Contributions of the Native States to the Indian Exchequer.

(30-10-1904.)

Since the Native States were incorporated into the British Empire the position of subordination has entailed enormous sacrifices on their part. The Native States have been termed the " partners of the Empire, " but the partnership is like that of a giant and a dwarf, wherein the weaker side invariablv goes to the wall. We will discuss the direct contribution made by the Native States to the Indian Exchequer. According to the census of 1901 the population of British India and the Native States is as follows :—

British India—23,15,60,664.

Native States—6,27,46,014.

The population of the Native States is a little over one-fourth of that of British India and as the blessings of peace are enjoyed by the Native States, it is argued that full 25 per-cent, of the total military expenditure of the Indian Empire should be borne by the native states. There is no tax such as a Poll-tax or a War-tax levied in India, the proceeds of which are exclusively appropriated for the purpose of defraying the military expenditure. The enormous outlay on the military department in India is paid out of the general Revenues of the country which are solely derived from the various taxes imposed on the people. The incidence of some of these taxes which go to form the nucleus of the revenues of India falls

on the subjects of native states and the extent of this incidence will conclusively prove that more than 25 p. c. of the military expenditure of the country is borne directly by the subjects of the native states. In dealing with this subject the difficulty at the outset is about the sources of information on this point. All the official reports and Blue books deal with the aspect of incidence of taxation on the various provinces which constitute British India. But how the incidence of various taxes levied by the Indian Government falls upon the subjects of Native States is studiously ignored from all the official publications. The main outcome of the Indian protectorate is the removal of all restrictions on the freedom of trade. There are no Inter-state barriers of customs duties or transit duties which prevent the expansion of British trade and commerce freely into the territories administered by the Native States. Mr. (now Sir William) Lee-Warner who is a past-master in the art of diplomatic and mischievous writings says that the " union of the whole Empire has been consolidated in recent years by numerous engagements with the Chiefs for the removal of injurious restrictions on trade. " The right of imposition of transit duties has been asserted by the British Government in its treaties with the Native States as an imperial prerogative. This important achievement of free trade has been instrumental in bringing to the Indian treasury a handsome quota of its enormous collections. The principal sources of the revenues of British India may be divided into two groups with regard to their incidence on the subjects of the Native States. The first group comprises the items of Land revenue, opium, stamp, registration, provincial rates, assessed taxes, and miscellaneous net receipts. The second group includes salt, excise, customs, forest, post and telegraph receipts, proceeds of railways and mint. The taxes included in the first group are collected from the subjects of British India alone. The Land-tax is paid by the ryots directly to the Government. The opium revenue is derived from the export trade of this drug and is not paid by the subjects either of British India or Native States. The Stamp and Registration duties are paid by those who have immediate interests in the transactions pertaining to British India and are paid almost

by the subjects of the paramount power. The Provincial rates and assessed taxes are distributed over the area of British India alone. The incidence therefore of the first group of taxes does not at all fall upon the subjects of the Native States. But the incidence of taxes mentioned in the second group directly falls upon the subjects of the Native States and they pay rateably according to their numbers. The salt tax is a monopoly of the British Government. Only three native states, namely Travancore, Jodhpur and Mandi possess the sources of producing salt. The Sambhar Lake and the Didwana and Pachbadra sources of salt though belonging to the Jodhpur State are worked and leased by the Government of India. The Jodhpur State receives a fixed amount for its share of royalty but the production and manufacture of salt is entirely into the hands of the British Government. The manufacture of salt is prohibited on pain of penaity everywhere in India and the heavy duty livied upon this article of daily necessity falls ihto the coffers of the Indian Government. The subjects of the native states consume salt as their fellow brethren in British India and the incidence of this taxation is proportionately borne by them. Thc customs duties though paid immediately by third persons are necessarily borne by the subjects of the native states according to the doctrine of the universal diffusion of taxes which prevails in every country. The several articles which are taxed under this head such as arms, ammunition, military stores, liquors, petroleum, silver bullion are the monopolies of the British Government and British traders and the subjects of the native states indirectly pay the taxation in proportion to their number. The principal sources of revenues of this head are derived from import duties, on arms, ammunition, liquors petroleum, cotton manufactures, countervailing duties on sugar, excise duty on cotton, &c.; all these articles by the introduction of free trade supply the wants of the subjects of the native states on whom the duty imposed upon these articles is saddled along with the proper cost. The excise revenue is made up of the license and distillery fees and duties on foreign liquors, country spirits, toddy, opium and its preparations, ganjya & other hemp drugs. Such of the native states as possess trees from which country liquor is produced have their Abkari

revenues farmed by the British Government and the native states receive a fixed amount for their share of royalty. The production and sale of all hemp drugs, that of opium and its preparations are the monopolies of the British Government. As the subjects of the native states consume these articles they contribute a proportionate share of the income derived from this source. The post office and the telegraph are the monopolies of the Imperial Power. The railways also are monopolised by the British Government. The subjects of the native States have manifold dealings with British India and bear the brunt of the taxation on this head. The subjects of the Native States travel through railways, carry on export and import trade through the medium of railway agencies; they use ordinary and service postage stamps, they remit money orders, registered articles and parcels to various persons living in British India and thus the taxes derived from these sources are distributed over them commensurate with their wants. The receipts derived from the mints are also borne by the Native States. With the exception of a few states the British Indian currency is the only legal tender in Native States. The British currency is also recognised as a legal tender in those few states which have their own currency system. But as the subjects of the Native States have wider dealings with the inhabitants of British India they prefer the universal legal tender to their limited currency. The effect of this system has been the gradual restriction of the State currency and the expansion of the British coinage. The forest revenue also is recovered by the sale of the forest produce such as teak Sandal Wool, Caontchone, Lac, Cutch, Gambler, Myrabolams and Cardamoms. The Native States with few exceptions have very little forest area at their disposal and they are obliged to make purchases of these articles and thus contribute to the income derived from these sources. It would therefore appear that free trade, free competition, imperial monopolies and prerogatives have made British India and the Native States, a world of perfect mobility where taxes are diffused over the entire extent and shifted to the individual according to his wants. And these considerations have totally removed the distinction between the sta-

tus of a Native State subject and British Indian subject so far as taxation is concerned. And as the wants of the various species of humanity are identical and as the distribution of taxation is unhindered in its course they all contribute to the revenues of British India. The following table will show the amount of revenues derived from the incidence of the taxes comprised in the second group and paid by the subjects of the Native States.

	Net Receipts.
Salt	5673991 £
Customs	3734517 £
Excise	4025770 £
Forest	1362227 £
Post office, Telegraph and Mint	158347 £
Railway Revenue account.....	846616 £
Total...	15801468 £
A fourth share contributed by the Native States, ...	3950367 £
Annual tributes from the Native States.	556980 £
Total...	4507347 £

The annual tributes recovered from the Native States have their origin in the subsidiary system which required the States to maintain at their expense troops for the protection of the British flag in India .The working of this system created various complications and ultimately it was abolished and the payment of annual tributes was made compulsory on the Native States. These tributes show the nature and extent of the obligation of participating in the defence which devolved on the States at that time. It has been asserted by certain writers that the tributes do not represent the pecuniary equivalent of the obligation of sharing in the defence but that they are a set off against claims relinquished by the East India Company. But none of them has tried to show what these claims are and what their nature is. A careful reading of the various treaties and engagements between the suzerain power and the Native States would inevitably lead to the conclusion that the annual tributes are the

substituted forms of the obligation of rendering service to the Empire. The subsidiary system also was based on the principles of feudal tenure and was introduced solely with a view to distribute the burden of the defence. Certain Native States agreed to contribute annual tributes and ceatain others ceded territories such as the Berars for adequately discharging their obligations in this respect.* The Native States, therefore, over and above, paying the expressed and stipulated quantum of the burden of defence are contributing incessantly a fourth share of the various taxes mentioned above

*Many Native States have ceded territories to the paramount power for the upkeep of the contingents and subsidiary forces which were gradually amalgamated into the regular British Army. They do not exist separately at the present time. The territories handed over by the Native States are incorporated into British Dominions. This arrangement was effected by the paramount power on the plea of efficiency of the army and administrative convenience. Whatever may be the reasons it was necessary in fairness to the Native States concerned to show the gross revenues of these territories under the head of tributes from Native States. Nearly 75 years have elapsed since these territories were taken from the Native States, the revenues have increased almost fourfold at the present time. The mention of this income under the head of tribute fromNative States would enable the reader to know the contributions made by the Native States for the defence of the Empire. The studious omissions to state the income derived from such territories as coming from the Native States in the official accounts has led to a great injustice to the states concerned and has lent colour to the fallacious doctrine that Native States are not bearing their proper quota of the cost of maintaining the peace and order in this country the advantages of which the Native States do enjoy along with British India. The hollowness of this mischievous cry raised by Lord Curzon and echoed by the Agakhan was completely exposed at that time.

II

(Indirect Contributions.)

11-12-1916.

The extent and magnitude of the advantages derived from the Native States are not properly appreciated by persons living in the British Territory. We shall categorically review them in this article. The British Government levies fees on succession to the Native States. The imposition of this burden is regarded as the prerogative of the Crown. Certain Native States are by express treaty obligations exempted from paying *Nazarana*. But the greed of the Political Department knows no bounds. The words of the treaty are twisted and strained, unnatural constructions are put upon the phrases employed in the treaty to suit the conveniences of any particular occasion for the exaction of this form of tribute. The adoption of the present Chief of Jamkhandi in the Southern Maratta Jahagirs is a flagrant instance on this point. The adoption of the present Chief of Jamkhandi was performed according to the letter of the treaty by the late Chief. But after the demise of Appasaheb Jamkhandikar *Nazarana* has been extorted from the State during the minority administration without any justification what so ever. The installation of a Prince or Chief or the marriage ceremony of a Maharaja is always made the occasion of a gathering of exalted officers such as the Viceroy, Governor, Resident and other European officers and gentry in the State. These festive occasions afford a pretext for sumptuous banquets pleasant sports and felicitous gaieties of a diversified character. Nazars are presented on such occasions and no pains are spared to make the guests feel comfortable and quite at home. The ordinary globe-trotters and cold weather tourists from Europe always come with introductory letters to various Chiefs and Princes all over India and enjoy their unstinted hospitality. His Excellency Lord Ampthill bore testimony to this in his speech at the Kashmir banquet. The Viceroy and the Governor, after the

trying work at the Secretariat and the worry of official red-tapism find relaxation in their usual visits to the Native States. Royalty is nowhere so highly entertained and magnificently welcomed as in the Native States in India. These States vie with one another in their receptions to an heir-apparent or a personage of royal blood. His Majesty the Emperor has retained a vivid impression of the costly and splendid reception given to him by the various Native Princes when he honoured them with his visit while in India. The Shikar enjoyed in the hunting excursions in Native States is very rare and entails a heavy drain on the resources of the Princes. The beating of the forest, the furnishing of camps in the wild jungles and the reception of the guest appreciably affect the resources of a State. The Princes and Chiefs in India are made to serve as a part of retinue in any triumphal procession of a Durbar such as that held at Delhi. The picturesque dresses, radiant jewellery, dashing equipage and the quaint followers of the Princes and Chiefs in India, all moving in an attitude of supplication and humility, produce an effect which only a master of ceremony like Lord Curzon can properly appreciate and utilize for the purpose of playing on the imagination of oriental races. These royal appendages are purposely attached to the present Darbars held by the representatives of the Crown to impress on the populace the idea of submission and unfettered conquest. The Native States in India contribute to various official and quasi-official schemes initiated by responsible officers in India. The Imperial Institute in London is a sorry spectacle of waste of subscriptions collected from the Native States. The Imperial Institute raised mainly from the funds of the Native States has very little to do with their well-being. The organizers of this institute betrayed the height of ingratitude when they lavishly spent their funds to entertain Colonial Premiers and representatives who were in no way connected with the interest of the Institute and did not even care to write to their patrons the Princes in India, who had assembled in London on the occasion of the Royal Jubilee. The Dufferin fund, the Victoria Memorial Fund and funds of this nature have received munificent help from the Native States. The Native States have also furthered the objects of charitable

institutions in the country. Universities, Colleges, Libraries, Museums, Public Parks and Dispensaries have received valuable contributions from Princes and Chiefs in India only for pleasing the Government. The votaries of officialdom and especially of those of an out-going Viceroy or a Governor count mainly on the support of the Native Princes for the erection of a statue of their favourite deities. In the world of sports, the Native States are to the front with their spontaneous (?) offers of pecuniary assistance. The various cups and prizes awarded to the successful winners of races show the nature of the support given by the Native States. The turf finds a great patron in a Prince or a Chief. The various Gymkhanas have in the list of their donors the various Princes and Chiefs who hardly participate in their advantages. Some of the Gymkhanas have not even the courtesy to admit those patrons into their sacred limits although they are not ashamed to receive help from them. The part played by the Native States in the coming Motor race would bring home the truth of our remarks. The capital of Scindia is to be the abode of coming festivities. The Maharaja is to play the host and receive the guests. The Native States have been used as pastures by various European companies who enjoy absolute monopoly in licenses, mining leases. and other facilities of exploitation. Certain European firms command the offers of some Native States for furnishing medical stores, stationery, furniture and sundry other articles required for consumption. A peripatetic juggler, a circus manager a reciter or any vagrant for that matter with any sort of credentials in his pocket feeds fat on the resources of the Native States in his rambles throughout the country. All sorts of unqualified persons and worthless mediocrites backed by chits from influential officials find shelter in the Native States and there play pranks with an impudence which a certificated beggar alone can command. We have lately heard the scandal of some Political Agents serving the double function of commission agents to various States in India and this evil is no doubt rampant in many parts of India. Even the wives of certain officers profusely meddle with the affairs of a Prince or Chief and at times chaperon his spouse in private life. In a few instances, this evil be-

comes simply intolerable. The heaviest burden comes from the quarter of official 'easements' of the political department. The system of perquisites is every day violating the moral code even in the opinion of such Anglo-Indian papers as the "Times of India." The *Times*, no doubt, very pertinently remarks that the conduct of certain political officers living practically free at the expense of certain Native Princes and Chiefs is "un-English." It is really a gross abuse of power that the responsible officers drawing fat salaries should indulge in easements which are dishonourable to the instincts of a righteous and upright officer. The political officer "rides his horses, drives his carriages, uses his cooks, shoots his big game, spends money right and left on improvements for his own luxury." We may multiply instances by adding that he uses his *bunglow*, appropriates his furniture, commands his summer retreats, receives gifts, accepts presents and enjoys all things that go to make up his life highly epicurian. Are these not an indirect contribution to the Empire at large and is it too much to expect that the recipients of all these favours should at least possess some consciousness of the sources from which they flow. As the administration of British India is stereotyped, it hardly admits of any latitude for the enjoyment of the various advantages mentioned above. The Native States serve as centres of recreation and pleasure to European Officials and travellers (and political week-enders) in India. They are the redeeming features of the routine administration and alleviate considerably the dulness and insipidity of the official life in this country. All these create burdens too large for the Native States and the fact deserv es recognition.

THE ORGANIZATION OF CREDIT IN EUROPE AND IN INDIA.

BY

"HISTORICUS."

(Sir Raymond West)
Raymond West

(Re-printed from the TIMES OF INDIA.)

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

Bombay:
PRINTED AT THE TIMES OF INDIA STEAM PRESS.

1885.

RR W 11

PREFACE.

THE writing of the following papers was undertaken as a means of freeing the writer's mind from the "rest" it had taken through a long application to studies of a wholly different kind. They are wanting in completeness and system though they contain the results of much occasional reading and observation on the important subject of which they treat. As the editor of the *Times of India*, in which they appeared, has thought them worthy of reproduction, this apology for their too obvious defects seems necessary; but criticism is not hereby meant to be deprecated. The fullest and freest discussion is the most promising source of improvement in this as in other departments of the social and political system.

THE ORGANIZATION OF CREDIT IN EUROPE AND IN INDIA.

I.

There never was an age probably in which a purely philanthropic desire to promote the welfare of the poor and needy was so distinctly made a basis of legislation as it is in the present generation. Admission to plays provided at the public expense at Athens had but a remote connexion with any feeling of benevolence. The doles at Rome were distinctly conceived as food for a wild beast whose hunger might be disastrous to its keepers. The indiscriminate charity which Christian priests inculcated and practised during many centuries had its uses and abuses, the mischief perhaps on the whole outweighing the good, but the practice has handed down a noble tradition to this modern time and amid the stress and strife of individual efforts "to get on" and gain an advantage in the struggle for life, we see in every direction patient and strenuous toil in mastering the problem of social existence under its modern conditions and in devising means for improving the moral and material state of the more helpless and ignorant classes. The suggestions of benevolence and of a "social science," which hardly as yet deserves the name, have been successfully pressed on the Legislature in every civilized country; and laws for the preservation of health, for the furtherance of education, for the regulation of labour, and even for the restriction of contracts as to land in the interest of the tenant supposed to need special protection, form a large part of the legislation of this latter half of nineteenth century. In some instances it may be suspected t legislation and regulation have been pushed rather too far; t society would have benefited more by a little wholesome neglect t by a fussy excess of direction; and that amid the mass of rules wh favour weakness and mediocrity of intelligence and character, force of personal initiative is lost, and numberless experiments untried which harder and less organized conditions of life wo have made inevitable. They would have been wrought out suffering, but the agonies of the present might have been but birth pangs of a more perfect future, as in the past great progress been usually purchased at the cost of pain. But torture, too, so as we can see, has often been borne in vain. Let us not envy ages in which improvement when it came had to be so dearly brou but rather congratulate ourselves that time and thought and

experience have placed us on an eminence whence we can see much of the tract that still lies before us. It must be traversed with toil, but the main direction of our necessary course may be foreseen with reasonable certainty.

It was inevitable that some waves of the general movements of thought set up in Europe should plash upon our Indian shores. The overland route, indeed, is a kind of intellectual Gulf-Stream, bringing to us perpetually a current of more genial life to raise us from the stagnation to which Eastern influences tend. Hence we have derived not only the great improvements in production, transport and manufactures that have changed the external conditions of Indian Life, but the fruitful and stimulating ideas, the knowledge hopes and aims that have made England great. Here, as there, though on a smaller scale and with less mastery of the problems to be solved, society and the Legislature have set themselves to the task of alleviating as far as possible the pressure of the higher on the lower strata of the community, and of making the inevitable exactions of the tax-collector as little exhausting as possible. Loans for agriculture and land improvement are in some degree provided for. There is a rent-bill in Bengal which sharply reminds land owners that property, as a fact, is distinguishable from property as a right. In Bombay a Factory Commission sits to ascertain whether the material good of the community can be safely and properly founded on the principle of working young toilers to death. In the Deccan agriculture is relieved not only from the harassment of unjust demands, but from all need of paying debts except at will. This is not calculated to draw the much needed capital to that part of the country; but the Government, having begun an experiment in the face of science and history, is called on now to make it successful in the face of failure by subsidies levied from other provinces.

In all these cases, and in others like them, an anxious desire may be discovered to lift the people to a higher level of comfort and well-being, but in all or nearly all there is at the same time perceptible a defect of science, and, what is stranger, a defective grasp of the facts of the situation, of the actual conditions of native life and social activity, which must be thoroughly understood before reform and progress can be placed on a secure and durable basis. Mr. Slagg remarked, as a member of the late committee of the House of Commons on Indian Railways, upon the absence in the witnesses of any adequate comprehension of the effect of railways upon the economical condition of people affected by them. The observation may be applied much more widely. There is in this country a general want of capacity to trace out the remoter consequences of measures and principles. The requisite ability no doubt exists; but the backward state of the native population prevents its presenting the official class with questions in such forms as to enforce inquiry

and close reasoning, while in the official sphere itself, mere expertness in the details of business, united with shallow and common-place views, is a much surer passport to promotion than close and systematic investigation, and the rigorous deductions from it that go to the making of a possible reformer, but a present and certain "troublesome fellow." Yet the tendency of mere routine to sink those who carry it on deeper and yet deeper year after year into the ruts of unreasoning habit and precedent is so strong, the incapacity to view any subject except from the accustomed stand-point is so certain to grow on those who are shut out from independent action, and in whom vigorous speculation is a sin, that the few men composing the Supreme and Provincial governments ought to do all in their power to encourage independent inquiry and the freest statement of the results to which it leads. Mere incompetence and conceit only need rope enough; but conceit, however disagreeable, often accompanies great ability. The ability should be quickly recognized, the conceit should be humoured with hard work. It would be well if, as was proposed some years ago, every young member of the Civil Service were expected after four, five, or six years in India to submit a monograph on some specific section of his own active work, or on some special subject connected with the system of administration and its effect on the people. The measure of a young man's capacity might in this way be much better taken than by the childish departmental examinations, and if the usual members of the Secretariat were excluded from the examining board, the essays would no doubt be judged by a higher standard than that of mere resolutions and "former proceedings." In the rapid course of material and moral changes, which India, and especially Western India, is undergoing, it needs constant inspection and reinspection by fresh eyes with well-furnished brains behind them. It is to this source that we must look for a true appreciation of the new conditions and new needs that are springing up under changed circumstances. If the work is to be done by officials the habit and ability for it should be formed early. If it is not done by officials, the future of India will be much influenced by such philosophy and powers of observation as are evinced in the writings of Mr. Wilfrid Blunt.

Among the sources of improvement that have been too little studied in India are the attempts at amelioration that have been made on the continent of Europe amongst populations much nearer than the English to the present state of the native community. A considerable resemblance, indeed, may be found between the economical and social conditions of large sections of the people in India and the inhabitants of Southern Europe. The presence and the power of Government are much the same in the one region as the other. The land tax bears more heavily on the Roman or Lombar-

peasant than on the ryot of Guzerat. The usurer devours the farmer's substance in Bavaria and in Sicily as in Nagpore and Poona. The type of character even is in some instances not unlike. The outburst of murder and pillage in the Deccan a few years ago may be compared with the brigandage of Calabria and Sicily. There is a general slavish submissiveness to extortion varied by spasmodic eruptions of violence, and relieved so far as may be by habitual procrastination, evasion, and inertness. Without carrying these comparisons further, the conviction may be stated that seeing what a state of things existed in several of the continental countries half a century ago, the measures by which great improvements have been attempted, and in many cases effected, offer examples full of interest and instruction to any one who is earnest in his desire for the welfare of India. The discussions and controversies of which one finds reports or echoes in the literature of the subject, sound strangely like some of those that arise from time to time amongst ourselves. The collapse of promising schemes prepares us for some failures here. The general result is a vindication of science in the political and economical sphere as opposed to empiricism or, what is still worse, unbalanced sentiment. Beneficence, it has been found, must be controlled by a severe regard for facts. The facts themselves need trained and penetrating observation. The wisdom learned of books has been found as a weighty sword, dangerous yet indispensable. An impulse once given to popular habits and desires has been found to carry them on to points that could not have been expected. Faith strongly founded on reason has been the original motive force, but it has not only impelled but quickened the mass on which it acted. New aspirations have arisen; new habits have been formed; a new consciousness of innate worth has been aroused, a new pride and happiness in the fulfilment of duty and in extending the hand of brotherhood to those who needed it. And all this has been done within the boundaries of science, yet, in the most striking instances, outside the sphere of Government. If men have thus been lifted out of apathy, improvidence and sloth, to share in the progress of the century, something surely may be learned from their story to which Indian Statesman and the Indian Patriot alike may well lend ear.

II.

An eminent economist has lately said that the place of a people in the scale of nations is determined principally by its power of "capitalization." Amongst savages there is little or no capacity for accumulating out of the produce of adventure and toil the means for further production. In such a country as Scotland, on the other

hand, almost every shilling, beyond what is absolutely needed for the daily interchanges of trade, is profitably invested, and so made an instrument for fresh acquisition. The same writer points out that the extreme slowness of the economical progress of Italy as of some other countries has been due chiefly to the sluggish pace at which capital found its way to the sources of production. Hence he deduces the consequence that the future of industry and commerce must depend, in a great measure, on a sound and effective constitution of institutions of credit in the various shapes to which skill, inventiveness, and necessity have moulded them.

Such considerations, if important in Europe, are pre-eminently important in India, and in this generation. The construction of railways and the general extension of communications have opened the way for commerce, on a wholesale scale, to the remotest districts of the country. To meet its demands and to profit by them, production in the spheres, both of agriculture and of manufactures, must be put on a footing widely different from that which satisfied the petty needs of earlier times. The quantities required are enormously larger, the profits realized on individual transactions are far smaller, than in the infancy of trade. The world at large gains infinitely by the lower charges at which the surplus products of its different regions are interchanged, and the Indian community takes its full share of this gain when it buys English machinery and metals; but in order to retain and extend its capacity for buying, and so supplying itself with necessaries and luxuries at the lowest cost to itself of labour and abstinence, it must adapt its own operations to the changed circumstances in which it lives. That organization of the productive capacities must be adopted, which will make them most productive; industries must be established where the elements of each are to be found in cheap abundance; they are to be concentrated or diffused as their own nature or the characteristics of the people may dictate. A new policy is needed for a world which in this sense is virtually new, and for every new enterprise the first requisite is an ample stock of available capital. There is needed also, it must be confessed, a certain change of character, or at least a certain sifting, by which the industrious and trustworthy may be assigned their proper places, far over the heads of the lazy framers of excuses for evading work. Is it possible, then, while drawing forth the hidden stores of wealth which lie unused in India, to elevate and "energize" the character of its labouring classes, so as to make them use the improved instrument to its full extent? The experience of Europe teaches that this may be done. It is a work that calls for some labour, patience, and self-renunciation on the part of its apostles; but its rewards are appreciable by all, soon realized, and attended with no risk of ruin, as are so many of the speculative enterprises in which men seek to conquer fortune at a stroke.

The revenue system of India imposes a sensible burden on agriculture and industry; but if it is compared with the pressure of taxation in such countries as Italy and Spain, one cannot but see that it offers no insuperable obstacle to economical progress. These countries have in the last twenty years made enormous strides in spite of revenue impediments. The reason has been a simultaneous diffusion of capital, of the will to benefit by it, and of capacity in the various spheres of employment for bringing the scattered and wasted forces together into productive relations. In India we are still hampered with the traditions of long centuries of ill-regulated revenue exactions on the one hand, met by evasion, clandestine gains, and pretended poverty on the other. The standard of living has thus been kept low, and in the struggle to throw an undue share of the aggregate burdens upon a fellow-villager, a character of mutual distrust has been developed, which must be replaced by mutual confidence as the necessary basis for any high form of co-operation. Unlimited freedom in agriculture, and in the disposal of land, was bestowed perhaps too suddenly upon ryots unformed for self-dependence. With their narrow traditional methods, and their extreme ignorance, and their defective realization of the future, they have too often proved quite unequal to the higher responsibilities thrust upon them. Much less have they adapted themselves, or can they, without guidance and help, adapt themselves to the increased exigencies they are now called on to meet. The sowkar system of the mofussil, useful and beneficial under the political and social system which gave birth to it, fails in these days to meet the entirely new class of needs which new circumstances have created. The sowkar is timid, exacting, an enemy to enterprize, jealous of competition, fond of subservience, incapable of large views, or of sympathy with the boldness which strikes out new paths to fortune. The native capitalist thus needs reforming quite as much as the native peasant or artisan—reforming in his range of knowledge, his ways of looking at the facts about him, his relations to his customers, and his conception of the proper functions and management of capital. At present he stands in the way of improvement much as the *monts de-piete* have been found to stand in the way in Europe, by fostering improvident and unpunctual habits, and the spirit of dependence, as opposed to the nobler tone of self-reliance from which all real improvement must spring. Tied and trammelled as the peasants and the sowkars are in a vicious entanglement of mutual relations, it is impossible, except by the substitution of a new organization animated with larger conceptions, and conducted with equal shrewdness, that they should fill the circle which is opening for them, or even escape a comparative falling-back, while other communities are rapidly pushing forward in the economical application of productive resources, in the systematic organization of labour, and especially in the skilful and fertilizing employment of capital. There must no doubt be a

vital historical connexion between the new economical state and the old one; but life means growth, and history is practically useless unless it is made a means for continuous improvement.

It may be said that the way to amelioration in the particulars here dwelt on, as in other respects, lies through an advanced and systematic education. And certainly one of the strongest arguments for a thoroughly good system of middle-class instruction may be found in the present incapacity of the great mass of the native community engaged in trade, manufactures, and the manipulation of money, to cope with the new and more complex conditions of success to which recent developments have introduced them. A thoroughly practical training in the rudimentary principles of commerce, exchange, and the action and reaction of manufacturing and agricultural industry on each other ought to be attainable in schools placed in such cities as Poona and Ahmedabad; and the course of instruction ought to be kept up to the mark by the presence in the governing bodies of men capable, through their own culture and experience, of judging both the ends and the means favoured by schoolmasters and directors of instruction. In the department of public education, as in every department, there is a tendency to sink into grooves, to reduce suggested reforms too much to a mere evolution of received theories, to lose that vital contact with reality which is essential to continued usefulness; and this evil of an airy unpractical method would be checked by the interposition of a good medium between "the system" and the people. But although this is all true, so true that a reform on the lines thus indicated will by and by be seen to be indispensable, yet in the meantime the capacity for business which undoubtedly exists requires moulding, the received maxims need translation into another and more expressive language to fit them for the larger purpose of the future. The rules of science, and the suggestions of theory, gathered from a stratum of thought and a field of experience to which the ordinary native of the mofussil—whether trader or cultivator—is a stranger, must be brought to bear on the peculiar conditions of local life and mutual relations with skill and wisdom as well as with sympathy and courage. For this purpose the mediation of the educated middle-class, both Native and European, is probably indispensable to high success. They must in the infancy of new institutions of credit take a part as dispensers of information, as correctors of Utopian ideas, as disinterested counsellors on matters of practice, even though they do not interfere with the autonomy of the bodies whose mentors they become. It is through independence that new institutions of credit must learn to fill the place they may take in the future; but this need not exclude a willing submission to prudent and disinterested advice. How this combination of men of different pursuits and social ranks has in other countries been made effective for achieving great economical results, I will presently try to show.

III.

When the revolutionary movement of 1848 extended to Germany, it seemed as though the fruit of many high aspirations, the reward of toil and poverty and suffering, endured by some of her noblest sons, were about to be gathered in the glorious harvest of a week. Consolidation, expansion, liberty, reconstruction in the modern spirit—all these and other inspiriting watchwords were on the lips of the assembly of professors and enthusiasts, who, borne up on the wave of popular excitement, felt themselves called to close the strife of centuries in the regeneration of their fatherland. There was a strange air of practicalness, too, in many of the designs and discussions of these patriotic men. In their prisons, in their studies, and their work rooms, they had learned from books all the intricacies of the existing system. They could give their teachings point from sad personal experience. Their own plans were in all ways designed to recognize the higher type of man that had grown up in every walk of life, save that of Government. The organization of capital and of production did not escape their attention. Schemes, which grovelling common-sense pronounces chimerical, but which socialism recognizes as a natural outgrowth of the sense of brotherhood that is to replace the selfishness of the past, were advocated with great earnestness and with a complete mastery of the common-places of economical science. But while the assembly was displaying its ability in discussion, and its wide range of abstract political knowledge, the impulse that had brought it into being had expended its whole force. Timidity, reaction, and a sense of intractable difficulty brought the popular energy to a stand-still. The habit of command, expertness in using the forces of Government belonged to those who had been born and trained to the business. The ferment of reform subsided, and absolutism reigned again, more absolute, as it seemed, than ever before.

Hereon followed a time of deep depression for the working class in Germany. The political storm was succeeded by exhaustion, aspiring confidence by dejection, distrust and irresolution. Trade languished, and the artisans, looked on by those higher in the social scale as a dangerous class, found little encouragement to exert themselves to rise by individual efforts, where a great national movement had, according to their conception, wholly failed. The truth is that the moneyed section of society, as a whole, dreaded nothing more in the middle years of this century than any material upward movement of their traditional inferiors. They had been thoroughly alarmed; and they bitterly resented the exposure of their helplessness. The Government even thought of curbing the power of the artisans by a renewal of the system of guilds with their exploded restrictions on enterprise and personal initiative. Meanwhile endeavours were made by kind-hearted persons to remove or relieve the prevailing

distress by means of loans and of work supplied to the half-famished operatives. A momentary alleviation was thus afforded; but in the cup of consolation was mingled the poison of dependence of alms-taking and pauperism. The inevitable tendency of such modes of assistance by moneyed persons has been vigorously demonstrated by Schulze Delitsch in his history of his own great movement. The lenders do not look for an assured return of their money: they do look for gratitude and subservience. They back up the claims not of those who will profit most by an advance, and be most certain to repay it, but of those whose cases seem the most pitiable, and such persons are, in a majority of instances, the most shiftless and untrustworthy of borrowers. "Every economical institution," Schulze declared, "which depends on the bounty of outsiders must needs lack vital force." He highly approved of charitable institutions in their proper place; but he insisted on their complete separation from institutions of credit, which, he constantly maintained, must stand or fall by their own intrinsic strength or weakness, unhampered by an effeminating dependence, which must prove as inevitably ruinous as the tippler's resort to stimulants. Nor would Schulze admit State aid any more than the benevolence of the "higher" classes. He, in fact, identified the two; and quoted Bastiat to the effect that "no State can subsist when the people have once learned to hold it answerable for this prosperity." No less dangerous to society, he contended, was the lesson of dependence of the poor on the rich, which foolish benevolence was inculcating. In the consequent decay of virile principles the aid given as a favour would come to be claimed as a right; and in the end a class animosity would thus be fostered which might well lead to a socialist revolution. "Cast away this imbecile dependence," he cried to the working class, "collect your own forces; rouse yourselves to a becoming pride and to confidence in your own resources." Those more fortunately placed he entreated to preach this doctrine, to further this development, as the great moral service, perhaps the only one, they could render to their countrymen.

This manly note was as a new gospel sounding in the ears of the respondent artisans of Germany. But how was their rescue and elevation to be worked out? Self-devotion was the first thing necessary; and Schulze, who was a judicial officer as Delitsch in Prussia, resigned his office in order to give himself up to the new organization from which he hoped so much. As a basis for his system he sought out no more recondite principle than that of the financial and moral effects of small savings collected into substantial masses, and then prudently dispensed in advances of capital to those members of the saving societies who could make the best use of them. In the progress of industrial development, through the introduction of steam-machinery, capital had become concentrated in comparatively few hands; the division of labour had

been carried to a point at which the individual workman stood almost helpless in the presence of his employer; and practical ability in a poor man was deprived of its natural position and exercise by the clogging medium in which it had to exist. A distinct rise in status was almost harder under the giant shadow of the manufacturing system than it had been even under the selfish and exasperating restrictions of the guilds three centuries before. Ambition, coupled with helplessness in the multitude, produced resentment and hatred; and socialism became the creed of the masses on the Continent of Europe, as it remains, and probably will remain, until some national experiment has proved its fundamental weakness. Such theorists as Blanc and Proudhon obtained in France a partial trial of industrial schemes which depended for success on virtues as yet undeveloped. They thought that external adjustments and fine phrases could forthwith call into activity the character and capacity requisite to give them vitality and working power. The results were disastrous; the bourgeoisie accepted the collapse as a proof of their own indispensableness; but the toilers still cling to the crucified cause which they esteem their own; and look for the millenium when the tools shall in every department be given to him who can use them—to themselves chiefly, as every material gain of civilization has been won by their patience and their toiling hands.

Schulze, loving the people and reading their thoughts through sympathy, perceived the peril that their brooding, erring discontent portended to society. The increased complexity of productive processes was a fact that must be faced and dealt with. If the artisan, or the manufacturer on a small scale, was in any degree to resume his former place in the industrial system, he must have that which was an irrigating stream to the great enterprises about him—Capital—at command on reasonable terms, and in such quantity as was needful to give a fair play to his skill and diligence. The ordinary banks could not or would not provide him with this first necessary; their operations were on too colossal a scale; the special abilities they had trained were adapted to a different kind of transaction from that which it was proposed to encourage; the managers and clerks of banks looked on poor people, who had never kept an account, with disdain and dislike. Clearly the requisite help could not be had from this quarter. The regeneration of industry required a preliminary creation of a new and appropriate system of credit.

Schulze had been struck, as many had been struck, by the enormous aggregate of the small sums accumulated in savings-banks. The capacity of the poor and struggling members of the community, as a source of capital, had thus been demonstrated; the use of the capital thus collected was of the least possible benefit to the class from which it had been drawn. Schulze formed his credit unions with a view by a single organization to stimulate saving and to encourage

industry with the least possible loss by friction of machinery. Every member of a union has to become proprietor of a share in the society. The full amount of this share being four or five pounds, the member may pay up the whole amount at once, or he may pay by instalments of a few pence a week, or a shilling a month, until the full sum is made up. Until it is made up his share of the profits, proportional always to his contribution, is added to it, and is thus capitalized. The union receives deposits from its members, and from outsiders, at a rate considerably higher than that allowed by the Government savings-banks. As a security for these deposits, it offers the mutual and unlimited liability of its members—this at least is the normal type, of the advantages and the necessity of which Schulze always remained a strenuous champion. The sums thus obtained are lent only to members of the society unless there is a surplus on hand which must be employed. The maximum loan is limited variously in the different unions. In some no more can be had than the equivalent of the borrower's share; in most twice this amount can be had. The borrower of a sum beyond what is thus secured must give other security either in the form of a pledge or hypothecation, or else the joint note of a solvent person, who in practice is usually a member of the union. Exactness in repayment is enforced, both as essential to the regular working of the society and on account of the economic discipline to which the union always seeks to make its members submit.

It might be supposed that societies constituted and working in this way would be embarrassed by many failures to repay the sums advanced by them. This, however, has not occurred except to a quite insignificant extent. The reason for this success in the working is to be found in the independence of each local union and in the mode of management. At the general meetings, even of the societies which allow several shares to be taken by a single member, the principle is almost invariably adhered to of "one man one vote." Every member thus feels that his personal influence is as great as that of his richer neighbour, and so acquires a greater interest in the concern along with a greater sense of responsibility. The general meeting elects a president, a controller, and a cashier, who together form the executive sub-committee managing the affairs of the union. They are members of a committee, including several other sharers, which meets at least once a week, and by which every application for a loan must be approved before it is granted. The members of this committee must go out of office in rotation, and without a capacity for re-election, one-third every year. In this way the tendency of societies to get into the hands of a particular clique is counteracted; and as the committee men are generally the most valued members of the society, an abundant stock of intelligence, and of local information, is brought to bear on every application for a loan.

A former failure or any laxness of habits is a fatal objection. Character, as in a somewhat different way under the cash credit system of Scotland, thus becomes a basis of credit equally important as the present possession of property. Every member is impelled by his own responsibility to exert a beneficial influence on his co-member; and the committee are generally apprised without delay of any particular in a borrower's means or conduct which may be likely to affect his economical capacity.

It is obvious that under this system every application is subjected to a sufficiently strict scrutiny. It may sometimes seem too strict to the intending borrower; and to provide against undue harshness there is in some cases a committee of superintendence or revision, which further reports from time to time to the general meeting of the union. The member refused a loan may appeal to this general meeting, which is called once a quarter or on a requisition of certain number of members, and by a majority it may give an order as to this or any other matter connected with the society. It may appoint and dismiss the officials, and may place on the management persons of known ability and kindly feeling towards the society. Thus the services are secured of men who can greatly advance the welfare of the institution, but who could not accept unlimited liabilities, while the ultimate control rests wholly in the hands of those who bear the consequent responsibility.

But whence come the funds for carrying on these humble banks? Besides the contribution of the members on the elastic system already described, there is an entrance fee of a trifling sum, not felt as a burden, but with others forming a fund of considerable amount in proportion to the whole capital as time goes on. Every new member of the society must be approved by the committee or by a general meeting, and on his admission he has to pay the admission fee, which in all cases goes to swell the reserve. When the reserve has thus risen to a material percentage on the capital, the intrant has to pay a proportional premium on his share in order to place him on an equality with the other members. A portion usually about 5 per cent. of the annual profits also is poured into the reserve fund. A member leaving the society may take out his share of the ordinary capital, but not of the reserve. This remains a perpetual security, so long as the union exists, for the fulfilment of its obligations in spite of casual failures and misfortunes.

It will have been noticed that there is no unfettered transfer of shares, any more than a uniform amount of "call" paid on each. A member is accepted as a co-operator in a work of common utility, and cannot retire at pleasure, leaving others to bear the brunt of some anticipated adversity. If he desires to withdraw he must give four months' notice ending with the working year; if he desires to transfer his interest he may do so only to an approved substitute; if

he commits a crime, he may be expelled by a general meeting, subject to an account carried on to the end of the current year. Such arrangements hold out no inducements to mere speculation : they are intended to draw in and retain men who can show their steadiness and earnestness by some small saving, and who desire that the funds collected shall be used for the promotion of serious and beneficial operations on however small a scale. A little credit is enough for a poor man, and as important for him as the thousands commanded by his wealthy neighbour.

Whatever opinion might speculatively be formed on institutions such as those I have roughly sketched, they have in practice achieved a marvellous success. Schulze contemplated the contributions of the members and the reserve as amounting, when a normal condition had been reached, to at least one-half as much as the deposits and borrowings of a union ; but chiefly through the abundance of money lodged and offered on loan, this proportion has never in late years been reached. The unions have spread throughout Germany to the number of more than three thousand, or with branches and connected institutions to the number of five thousand. No better proof could be given that they have met a widespread want, and serve a beneficial purpose. In nearly all instances they have remained faithful to the first purpose of their institution : they foster petty industry and personal energy, studiously avoiding all speculative business, and all entanglement in great transactions. In a few cases they have been virtually taken possession of by the middle class of shopkeepers and small manufacturers. In serving the purposes of this class they perform a function only one degree, if at all, less useful than that for which they were designed ; and being thus appropriated, they leave the field open for other humbler institutions on the original plan which have still their way to make. This has been conspicuously the case in Italy, where the principle of unlimited mutuality has been generally rejected, as it has also in France and to some extent in Belgium. Out of the surplus profits means have been found to give a measured but material aid to various forms of industrial co-operation. Agricultural credit has been found to admit the application, with some modifications, of the same principles as urban industry ; and in one or another form credit associations are becoming throughout Europe the great source and support of economical development amongst the poorer classes.

IV.

The position and the work of the popular banks in Europe being so important, it will be worth while to dwell with some little detail on their constitution, their mode of working, and their effects, as compared with those of rival institutions. It may be desirable, too, to

define as far as may be the true limits of their influence. They have no magic formula for creating capital out of nothing, but they bring existing rills of capital together which else would run to waste. They have not finally solved the problem or ended the conflict of capital and labour; but they have mitigated its bitterness, and have won over many who had else been the most irreconcilably hostile to the policy and promotion of peace and mutual concert.

A characteristic feature of the credit unions in North Germany is the "solidarity" or unlimited mutual guarantee of the members of each. In South Germany and Austria this type has been but partially followed; in France, Belgium and Italy it has been generally rejected in favour of limited liability, as also amongst the various investment societies of Great Britain. In the infancy of the system when a small group of members formed the first union at Delitsch, relying, beyond their own capacity for saving, on their known respectability in their humble sphere, it was absolutely indispensable, in order to win even a limited confidence from depositors and lenders, that the bond of mutuality should be entered into. Each member by thus exposing himself to ruin in the event of failure gave the best possible pledge of his own serious interest in the undertaking, and of his confidence in his fellows. It is obvious, too, that when the stake of each member was for him so important he would devote his best energies to the welfare of the union. As a shareholder with limited liability he might find his interest in taking up loans or procuring them for his relatives in ways perilous to the institution. On these considerations Schulze always relied in his advocacy of unlimited mutuality. But when he dwelt on the much greater security afforded by this system, his reasoning failed for the more developed stages of his creation. A creditor could not practically enforce his claims against some hundreds of poor people reduced to penury by a failure of their union. Unlimited liability kept out a number of cautious, tolerably prosperous members, whose co-operation was most desirable. When a certain range of business and a proportionate reserve had been attained, Schulze himself recognized that a perfectly adequate security could be offered without unlimited liability. It is probable that the strong sense of brotherhood in a great and elevating work, which animated the unions thirty years ago, could hardly be found in the present day, and outside Germany. The rigorous discipline of the working class under the German laws had given to them a unique preparation for combined undertakings. This could not be reproduced elsewhere. Nor, as experience has proved, is unlimited liability at all essential to the good management and prosperity of these institutions. When unions of the two classes work almost side by side as in a few instances in Italy and Belgium, their relative success does not seem to be materially affected by the presence or absence of this particular ele-

ment in their composition. What capitalists look to is the reserve chiefly; after that to the character of the management and the financial competence and respectability of the members. But limited liability does not imply unrestricted freedom of transfer. This has almost invariably been avoided, as assimilating a union too much to an ordinary joint stock company. It was adopted in the unfortunate People's Bank of Florence, and contributed something to the crash of that undertaking. Moral value cannot be passed from the old member to the new by a mere transfer in a register, and character is still, in a great degree, the basis of the popular banks.

The popular bank or credit union has not, like the joint stock company, a capital definitely limited and paid up in equal proportions on every share. New members may join on the terms prescribed by the general meetings until the institution reaches the limits of easy management. The original members have the option of paying up the full amount of their shares whenever they will, or of paying only a small contribution every week or month. To the extent of their contribution they enjoy the advantages of the union, except that their dividends go towards making up the amount of their shares.

In this way the capital of a popular bank grows up by degrees to the amount necessary for a beneficial conduct of its affairs with a view to its original purposes; and it is not allowed to grow beyond that amount. The members being interested in the double capacity of sharers and borrowers, there is no temptation to charge more than a fair rate of interest, but should more be charged, and large profits be made, these come back in great part to the borrowers themselves. Outside borrowers are not sought for or desired. If of the right stamp they can become members; if not, the union would be untrue to its purpose either in exacting a high interest from them or in encountering an equivalent risk in dealing with them. The difficulty of getting an advance without membership is a strong inducement to join the society: this implies previous saving, and the effort to save once made successfully tends to become a habit. In some instances no doubt friends supply the small sum payable on entrance; but this again is a token of confidence which the society may well accept as a valid testimonial of character.

The popular bank lending for the most part to artisans, and traders and manufacturers on a small scale, makes its advances generally by discounting bills or notes of three months' term or less. Its cash credit may be closed on notice and the debtor called on to pay up the amount due by him. Such a notice, however, would often cause serious embarrassment by coming just at the time when the member could least obtain accommodation elsewhere. In order to prevent such inconvenience, and to make "runs" impossible, loans are taken by the unions either for definite periods, having relation to the engagements of the bank, or subject, in the case of considerable sums, to

notice of repayment extending even to three months. Similarly, deposits, which are loans in a particular form, cannot, except in insignificant sums, be withdrawn except after notice of various lengths from a week to three months. Within three months a union can always make provision for any exigency, as its whole fund is usually turned over within that time, and it has only to restrict its loans to pay off its creditors. Its principle and mode of business, however, differ widely in this matter from those of an ordinary bank, though, like an ordinary bank, it will discount its own deposit receipts on terms favourable to itself. There is a strong inducement in the liberal interest allowed for persons to deposit by way of investment; but little or none to the speculative class of customers, who reflect upon an ordinary bank all the fluctuations of the money market. In this way as confidence grows a mass of term deposits is formed, which remains almost wholly undisturbed by any storm or crisis outside the institution. A panic does not usually last three months, and it works for the most part amongst a class quite apart from that of the investors in a credit union's obligations.

I have already pointed to the individuality and mutual independence of the credit unions in Germany as a main cause of their great success. This autonomy and absence of centralization, by no means, exclude mutual confidence and co-operation. These, indeed, have been carried so far that there is at Berlin a central committee for establishing communications between the unions scattered all over the country. There is also a central bank, the capital of which is composed of contributions from the unions desirous of a ready interchange of their funds which would otherwise lie idle. But these institutions are centres of communication merely, not of direction. Each union adapts itself by its own intelligence to the specific needs of its own locality. This is a principle of the utmost importance—so much so, that even in France itself, the centre of centralization, all the distinguished economists who have interested themselves in the diffusion of credit have recognized that popular banks must everywhere be in intimate contact with and actuated by the people. It is thus that the tastes have to be formed, the intelligence imparted, the sense of independence and honest pride trained, which make the moral capital of a union, an element less ponderable but not really less important than the accumulated coin.

By means of the central committee all the unions are speedily made acquainted with every new experiment tried by any one of their members. Congresses, moreover, are held from time to time, both general and local, at which views and criticisms are freely interchanged. Independence, therefore, is not attended with isolation, and the narrowness produced by defective information. There is an eager desire for improvement and a commendable readiness to try any promising scheme within the limits of reason and prudence.

V.

The brief description given in my last paper was intended chiefly to make plain the central principle of the popular banks as engines for bringing together the scattered energies, moral and material, of the great class of respectable people hampered by want of means in getting fair play for their abilities. I have, I believe, shown how prudence has been encouraged, hope kindled, and energy stimulated by holding out to thrift its fair reward, and by bringing home to the struggling member of the crowd, that for him as for his wealthier neighbours, character was convertible into credit. In combination the poor have found a means of sifting and refining their own conceptions, which tends to elevation, progress and harmony of classes. Such is the moral and social gain to the community through the establishment of the popular banks. Let us turn now somewhat more particularly to the external effects of these institutions. Local unions holding out as an initial temptation the offer of a liberal rate of interest have been proved by trial to be far more efficacious in drawing to themselves the savings of the people than the so called Savings Banks. Being constituted by a group of neighbours and acquaintances, they are much more before the eyes and on the tongues of the humble community. Their affairs are comparatively public; the good they do, and the profits they gain, are not hidden away in a mass of other transactions extending all over a kingdom or province. Their influence thus comes home far more forcibly to the minds of the working class than that of the impersonal Savings Bank. The prudent wife can appeal to known examples in urging her husband to dispense with some needless luxury, and it is the habit of sparing and of self-denial, which is all important, and needs fostering, by telling instances of what frugality may accumulate, and what organization can do with the fund. The necessary source of capital is saving, a truism too obvious for mention but for the frequency with which it is lost sight of in the dazzling presence of schemes for creating wealth as by some magical process. There may be a transfer of wealth, but no creation of wealth without frugality. But frugality alone, though it accumulates, is quite unfertile. The means acquired must be employed, must be made a support for industry, in order to be of use to their owners and to the community. To these simple principles the attention and the faith of the masses in India should be constantly drawn by their educated countrymen. The benefits of a reserve in tiding the poor man over difficulties should be impressed on the minds of the labouring classes, and the opportunity for laying by sums, however small, should be afforded to them in every town and village. The Government treasury may be at a considerable distance. The delay that occurs in every Government office causes a costly waste of time. Even a Post Office Savings Bank system is over-troublesome when people have to be coaxed out of habits of apathy and improvi-

dence. The rate of interest which a well managed Mutual Society can afford to allow on deposits exceeds by at least fifty per cent., the rate allowed by a Government Savings Bank; and the quick and visible growth of his capital operates as a strong stimulus to further savings in the case of the peasant or artisan. Human nature is much the same everywhere, and in Europe it has been found that the taste and capacity for saving once introduced amongst a class accustomed to live from hand to mouth tends to develope itself almost in geometrical progression. If the stolid distrust of the Indian peasant can once be overcome by sympathetic and judicious inducement, there is no reason to doubt that he will save, and spare, and practise self-denial, in order to make up a fund, just as perseveringly as his brother in Europe.

A striking instance of the almost unlimited effectiveness of steady and persistent thrift and investment even under the most unfavourable circumstances is afforded by France before the Revolution. In spite of capricious taxation, of administrative disorder, and of the oppression of petty tyranny in every direction, the French peasantry contrived to become masters of a great part of the land they had tilled as serfs and dependants. In spite of all the obstacles interposed by the law, the gentry, eager for ready-money at any cost, contrived to transfer for it nearly all the beneficial interest in their estates. Thus every small saving won by toil and privation became productive capital in the hands of the agriculturist; and he could in many cases make a little fortune out of some improvement before the lumbering fiscal machinery could legally be brought to bear upon it and make it fruitless of reward for the future. Now that saving is quite feasible in India is proved by a large number of persons who do in fact save. There are frequent instances of agriculturists rising from one grade to another as proprietors. A good system of credit would place far more effective instruments in their hands, and thus improvement and accumulation would proceed at an accelerated pace. Both to promote saving then, and to make it increasingly effective, local and familiar institutions ought to be planted within the reach of every Hindu who has from time to time even an anna or two annas to spare. The attraction operating on the small hoards innumerable, stowed idly away in holes and corners, would by-and-bye be found irresistible, and mofussil trade would be relieved from its present greatest impediment, the want of local capital and currency to work the traffic of the busy season.

A great advantage of local Credit Associations worked by the people themselves as compared with Savings Banks conducted by the Government consists in the much quickened and more certain return of the sums contributed and deposited to the class from which they have come, the class most needing capital, and most hopeless of obtaining it according to the ordinary system. According to this

the sums collected are sent to the capital cities. There they are invested in the purchase of Government stock. The purchase money goes into the hands of bankers and capitalists, and if it comes back to its local sources at all, finds its way to them only by a circuitous course passing through the hands of many intermediaries, each one of whom takes toll for his services. It is easy to see how attenuated the would-be irrigating stream becomes before it reaches the field it has to fertilize. Compare with this the circulation secured by a well organized local society. The money obtained in part from every class, but mainly from those in poor and middling circumstances, is directly diffused again amongst those who can use it most profitably in the same neighbourhood. The fertilizing current is subjected to the least possible waste owing to the shortness of its course. Borrowers are best selected by local committees having a personal acquaintance with the moral and material resources of applicants. Thus, the risk of insolvency being reduced, business can be done at a small difference between the interest allowed and charged; while every dividend earned by the society is at once a refund to the principal borrowers of a part of the interest they have paid, and a strong evidence, coming home to the consciousness of their friends and acquaintances, of the great advantage of becoming a capitalist even on the most modest scale.

The objection has been taken to Credit Unions both in Germany and elsewhere that they indeed further the interests of that higher stratum of the poorer class which least needs aid, but that they do nothing for the really indigent. These men, it has been urged, want aid on the pledge of their labour and their honour; to require preliminary saving from them is a mockery. Such a view of the subject has a strong appearance of reasons; and when a movement was set on foot for introducing the Credit Unions into Italy, it was taken up and advocated by many able and generous men in a controversy in which nearly all the most distinguished economists of the country joined. Yet the result was to satisfy all unprejudiced persons that, for the present generation at any rate, the safeguard of prior saving was indispensable. As Luzzati demonstrated convincingly the moral capacity of the working man, his probity, industry and self-command, must be transformed into saving in order to satisfy the only practical test by which he can be surely distinguished from the prodigal and unprincipled point. An indiscriminate admission of a crowd of borrowers would lead to almost immediate ruin. Reliance even on mere good character would involve a risk that must be paid for; and the payment would make the rate of interest inordinately high. The object was not to relieve paupers, but to prevent pauperism. It was necessary to sift the class of those who would safely be helped from the mass, in order that any help might be effectual; and to trust to time, example and moral influence

for a gradual extension of the capacity for membership to lower and lower strata in the scale of means. Attempts have been made from time to time to work societies on the basis of a mere pledge of the expected proceeds of labour, but these have proved wholly unsuccessful. Human nature has not yet reached the requisite pitch of integrity. But by a gradual and cautious extension of their operations the unions themselves have done something under the protection of suretyship and assurances of character, to gather in members from the crowd of shiftless irregular labourers, to open a way of hope for them and gradually place them in the ranks of the comparatively prosperous and independent.

A striking example of the danger of going too fast and too far, and of the evil of over-centralization, was afforded by the People's Bank of Florence. This institution aimed at covering the whole field of financial enterprise; and sought to re-animate industry and commerce in Italy by a bold employment of capital. Its straying from the path of prudence ended in disaster to itself and to thousands who had been befooled by its brilliant enticements. On the other hand, the popular banks of the North of Italy, as shown by *M. Say* in his *Dix Jours dans la Hante Italie*, have found the means, out of the large profits they have realized, to assist many infant enterprises on the co-operative principle, which now enjoy a fair prospect of success. A similar use of surplus funds has, in several instances, been most beneficially made in Germany, but the results have not been uniformly encouraging. The profitable working of a co-operative factory, as distinguished from a bank or store, involves force of character and capacity for rule in the manager, as well as a thorough knowledge of the business. It implies, too, a disciplined readiness to submit to orders on the part of the operatives, without the pressure of the social respect which bends them to the directions of their superiors in fortune and education. The little commonwealth requires a basis of virtue such as Montesquieu postulates for a republic on a greater scale. For such a development of co-operation India will not, it may be feared, be wholly prepared for some generations to come; but associations for credit, for consumption and for procuring machinery and materials involve only an earlier stage of economical development, and may be made the steps by which the higher stage shall ultimately be reached of capital, diligence, and ability everywhere active, and co-ordinated in producing a maximum of human enjoyment.

VI.

A critical examination of the working of the popular banks of Germany in their mature state seems to disclose that while they have been of the greatest assistance to the small employers of labour and petty traders, their effect on the great mass of the working class

has been rather less than had been anticipated, and has not relatively increased in recent years. The more prudent and sensible artisans have, indeed, been caught up by the system in thousands, and have by its aid been placed on a distinctly higher social platform; but this marked elevation, as a workman reaches it, seems in a great measure to cut him off from the class to which he formerly belonged. He is not so much a means of leavening the mass of ignorance and improvidence as a mark for envy and distrust, as his improved means give him advantages over those who have none, and his industrial activity naturally takes a line which his former comrades, instructed by Lassalle and Karl Marx, think false and fatal to their interests. It may be feared that the almost universal socialism of the working men on the Continent is not made any the less selfish, bitter, and unreasonable by the cream of their class being swept off from time to time and placed apart from any great interchange of influence, sympathy, and good offices for the future. India is, as far as possible, removed from any danger arising out of socialistic views, accepted as sacred and prophetic by a powerful proletariat. So far as views at all, beyond suggestions carelessly borrowed from foreign sources, can be discerned in the current native literature, they point rather to communism than to socialism—a peculiar communism, in which everyone is to be provided with a public employment, and in which consequently all development would become stunted and distorted. British guidance may point the way to worlds unknown of economical and political progress, but growth implies assimilation, not mere gazing even with appreciation, much less with conceited censure on the examples laid before us. In all reading of the continental literatures on the practical solution of the great problems of capital and labour, one is referred again and again to England as the well spring of ideas that have assumed such manifold forms elsewhere. In every work of note one finds ample recognition of the virtue of the truly British principle "self-help"; the phrase, without an exact equivalent, stands out from the foreign letter-press as a fit index of the nation whence it was derived. It is on this principle that reform of the Indian industrial system must be based. The existing defects must be discerned, not by reference to any theoretical standard, but by a searching analysis with regard to Indian facts and Indian capacities; the proposed remedies must not rest on any mere abstract conceptions, but on the "conjunctions of men and things," on a clear view of the possibilities presented by circumstances and character. Activity, good humour, and indefatigable energy must take the place of listless whining; the men of light and leading must cry "come on," not "go on," and be themselves foremost in the struggles and risks of the battle of progress. Such is the teaching that Schulze's life and works afford.

In Italy even more than in Germany the popular banks seem to

have been diverted from their original purpose of aiding the class of artificers to that of supplying the lower middle-class with a profitable investment, and with facilities of credit similar to those enjoyed by the ranks immediately above them. The general rejection of unlimited liability caused an influx of petty capitalists, who have in a great measure elbowed out the working men. The same consequence, though not to quite the same extent, seems to have followed from the same cause in France and Belgium. The conclusion drawn by some investigators is that it is only by means of complete mutuality that the banks can be preserved for the uses of those who most need them. A not less reasonable inference, however, seems to be that those who drank up the new supply were the most thirsty, and that now, when they have been satisfied, there will be a sufficient flow of accommodation for less eager and less profitable claimants. By the same, or by kindred institutions, there is no doubt that capital will now be furnished to the humble class in such ways as prudence allows, and in such quantities as may be requisite to give free play to their industry, invention, and expertness.

The topics then, which I gather from the investigation carried thus far and propose to Indian thinkers and workers, are these. Does the present torpid, unprogressive character of Indian productive industry admit of improvement? Is such improvement (apart from technical education in schools) to be best wrought out on the basis of individual labour perfected in its methods and appliances—on the basis of grouping and division of labour on a small scale, or on the basis of the complete factory organization? How can this amelioration be best furthered by the application of capital? How can local funds be most effectually drawn forth and made productive? How can habits of saving and sparing best be fostered, and combined with a spirit of reasonable enterprise in employing the sums thus accumulated? How can a tender sensitiveness on the point of mercantile honour, leading to the scrupulous performance of engagements, best be diffused amongst the people as a condition of their access to working capital at moderate rates of interest? How can the people best be awakened to an active desire for independence of position, and willingness to endure the sacrifices with which it must be purchased? to a perpetual watchfulness for means and opportunities of progress? The history of the popular banks affords abundant hints to those who can use them aright; but it by no means suggests that a crude introduction of the system which has worked admirably in Europe would be a blessing to India. Even in Europe national peculiarities have necessitated considerable variations from the original type; in India, it may be (there is much to suggest it), that the dispersed capital of the mofussil, when collected into effective masses, can be best dispensed on the Scotch system of cash-credits combined with the issue of interest bearing obligations. The method of the popular banks admits this

amongst other less familiar modes of supplying capital. It even admits loans on mortgage and hypothecation, to a limited extent. On all such questions native sagacity and knowledge should be brought to bear.

The great cause of the astonishing success of the co-operative societies in Germany is traced by Schulze himself to the fact that they were a natural and unforced growth, springing up in response to unofficial impulse. There was a real want, though it was but half realized. Schulze's own merit, ranking as genius according to Hegel's definition, was in his exact perception of what his people and his age were blindly craving, and his exact adaptation of means to meet the need. His plans rested on no hostile feeling to the officials who had sought to frown him down, on no mere speculative considerations of the rights of labour; they aimed at no miraculous results. They were in the highest degree practical; grasping the facts and accepting them, they were highly successful. It is on this indispensable condition that any analogous scheme of amelioration for India can be launched with a fair prospect of success. Mere imitation of the externals of Schulze's invention will not do; the imitation, if there is imitation, must consist in piercing with true insight to the very heart of the economical unrest, and in teaching our generation how with its own means to cure that, and to convert it into content, stability, and progress. When one sees how amongst Indian workmen time and energy are frittered away in desultory unsystematic exertion; how the provision of raw materials is subjected to the profits of a series of middlemen; and how between the finished article (except when made to order), and the consumer another series of middlemen is interposed, the inference is inevitable that by better arrangements a much larger product could be obtained from an equal expenditure of energy. In many places the price of provisions is so low that men and women could work and live in reasonable comfort on money wages which elsewhere would produce starvation. Provisions, so cheap, and labour, so plentiful, ought obviously to be embodied in material objects, which could be placed in the market at low rates as a means of purchasing comforts and luxuries to which the producers must otherwise be strangers for all time. Generally it may be said that wherever food is exceptionally cheap, there is a place for prosperous manufactures, provided the human elements be not wanting. The Hindu is everywhere tractable, orderly, and moderately intelligent. Amongst the lower ranks the capacity to organize their industrial force is wholly wanting. This essential element of successful production their educated and moneyed countrymen must supply; and with them too, in practice must rest the determination of the form that the credit system is to take by which the industrial organization is to be nurtured and supported.

VII.

In bringing the principles of the Credit Unions to bear on a rural population through land-banks and agricultural banks, an important difference of conditions has to be taken account of at the outset. The artisan or small trader turns his investment over very quickly. He can repay what he has borrowed to buy raw materials or goods for his trade in a very short time. The owner of land or a house, on the other hand, who lays out money in improving it, cannot expect to recover his outlay except by slow returns spread over several years. This, indeed, has been recognized in India both by the native and by the British Governments in the exemption from taxation (or the partial exemption) granted by "Kowl" to the cultivator, who would reclaim land from the waste and prepare it for high cultivation. Even in the case of money lent to buy manure or seed the return is slower than in trade; while a loan for live-stock or implements repays itself still more slowly. Long terms of credit, therefore, must be allowed by a bank operating amongst an agricultural class; and this implies borrowing by the bank itself on similar terms if it is to avoid the risk of suspension of payment. Schulze saw this distinction clearly, and declared that his union was not suited to agricultural purposes; but the principle of mutuality at least, it was obvious, might be used for obtaining agrarian capital. It had indeed been thus used for almost a century by the society of Silesian landholders. On this principle were founded the Raiffeisen Agrarian Unions, which proposed especially to furnish loans to buy farming stock, and to build or buy cottages. For the latter purpose they had been long anticipated by the English Benefit Building Societies, but these societies worked almost entirely on their own accumulated capital, while the former borrowed freely, and on short terms. The loads for building, however, form but a small portion of the operations of the German societies. It seems that these have worked on the whole with considerable success in the country of their origin, though not with the striking success that has attended the Credit Unions in the towns. In other countries their progress has been relatively slow. Economists in Italy contrast the limited extent of their operations, in that country of expensive agriculture, with the rapid growth of business of the popular banks. In France the Credit Agricole, an off-shoot from the Credit Foncier, adopted the principle of discounting the securities of local agents, who themselves made advances to agriculturists, as though in India sowkars should thus be supplied with capital. Short terms of payment, originally prescribed, were found inconsistent with the conditions of agricultural industry, and the maximum was raised to three years. To provide funds the society issued its own obligations, with a term of five years, and made its advances in this form, leaving the borrower to get the notes discounted. The society rose quickly to prosperity, but less on its business with agriculturists than

on its transactions with traders and manufacturers of various kinds connected more or less directly with agriculture. The chief reasons assigned for this are: (1) the difficulties caused by the law of hypothecation; (2) the right of distraint. These exist in India; and here, too, a good system must, as in France, encounter the opposition of a host of small dealers who pre-engage the crops, and who are concerned in the maintenance of a high rate of interest, which forces the peasant to sell his grain almost as soon as it is reaped to provide for his taxes and other inevitable disbursements. In this country a great part of the annual crop is pledged or sold before it is grown, on such terms as avarice dictates to ignorance and poverty; but, on the other hand, the capitalist has in the profit he exacts to cover the risks of dishonesty, dilatoriness, and positive inability of the debtor to pay. In his purchases, when the crops first come to the market, he simply speculates, as he must do, on the probable rise or fall of price; but the great fluctuations that occur show that sales are forced on the producers by want of money. They could pay well and still gain largely by short loans on their stocks, which would enable them to hold over until the flood of the market had passed away.

In Italy economists complain that, while the taxation has risen to a point never before attained, the interest of money, as high in some places as 20 per cent., imposes an additional and crushing burden on industry, and especially on agricultural industry. Under such conditions the economical resurrection of their country, they say, is merely a phrase of empty rhetoric, or of cruel mockery. Along with an improvement of the fiscal system they call for a great and sustained effort in the more neglected parts of the country to establish credit on a sound and beneficial footing. The districts thirst for capital, and capital waits to pour into them; the one thing needful is a good organization of the means whereby they may be brought together in a fertile union, and to such an organization the best energies of the country are now assiduously directed. These lamentations and complaints of patriotic Italians over the obstacles to their country's development would, if translated into Marathi, serve pretty well for wailings over the Deccan. In both regions the causes of the prevailing depression are complex and historical. The depression cannot be removed by any single heroic remedy; but an improvement of the credit system is at any rate indispensable, while the means of amelioration found successful in European towns seem to have all but failed in the rural districts. Two things are chiefly wanted: (1) security more complete and readily realized; and (2) improved prudence and intelligence in the peasantry. How these qualities, where they exist at all, may be fostered and developed has already been shown; but it seems that in the new and more arduous conditions of modern life it is impossible, where all are struggling to the

front, but that the more stupid, weak, and improvident should relatively fall behind. Capital must be used to make agriculture pay, and these poorer specimens of their class have not the power to use it well. The gift would be a fatal one; for capital, large or small, is a two-edged weapon, destructive to him who has not learned how to wield it. To attempt, then, to crop up as independent cultivators those members of the class who are incapable of satisfying the essential conditions is to labour in vain, because it is striving against the natural order of things, and the survival or superiority of the fittest. Whether we will or not, fate andcircumstance will sift out the more capable; give them prosperity; and place their former fellows under them as labourers. This economical revolution is in some measure going on under our eyes. It would advance far more rapidly if the competent were not artificially kept down as far as may be to the level of the incompetent, and all denied the inestimable benefit of freedom, protection, and responsibility in their dealings, because some are too imbecile for freedom. The labourer himself will be far better off in his natural rank, with labour made fifty per cent. more efficient, than if he had remained a cultivator on his own account without ability, spirit or strength of character.

Treating the matter then within the purely economical sphere we must look for improvement chiefly to the energies of the more efficient cultivators being allowed to act and to adapt themselves to the situation, untrammelled by foolish coddling; and to the removal of every obstacle which may impede their free use of their property as a basis for its own more profitable cultivation. The case is one, however, in which both local and general interests are concerned. The legislature in making special provisions for loans of public money for land improvements has recognised that in the appropriate cases agriculture may at least claim the aid of a fair start from the community. The principle is one fraught with dangerous consequences if pushed but a stage too far; and probably when a better organization of credit has been secured, the proper course for the Government would be to retire into the background, and leave such transactions to the adjusting play of demand and supply; but in the meantime the state of every owner's title should be made as plain as good arrangements can make it. Moreover, the warehousing system should be encouraged in the districts suited to it. So much having been done for making transactions safe, an attempt to render them intelligent and profitable should be made by so framing favoured institutions of credit as to attract to them the sowkars, much as local bankers became agents, for the Credit Agricole in France. We should compel them to come in, with all their shrewdness and personal knowledge, by making it plainly their interest to do so. This is feasible, in all likelihood, with perfect fairness

to them; for with safeguards against impositions on the part of an agrarian bank, and effective means of preventing evasion, the present enormous waste in petty imposition, wrangles, evasion, dunning and litigation might be saved to the lending and borrowing community as a whole, and would constitute in itself a fund out of which all parties could benefit.

Regarding the facilitation of access to capital, however, as a matter of concern beyond the circle of those immediately engaged, it is plain that the village, taluka, and district, are more nearly affected by the transactions within them than are other districts or the province at large. The public support, therefore, which credit institutions can claim, should come as much as possible from their own neighbourhood. Now in Switzerland, the cantonal banks of issue may be guaranteed by the canton to such an extent as the community thinks fit. Where such a guarantee is given every inhabitant of the canton acquires a personal interest in the prudence and prosperity of the local bank. Some such expedient might well be adopted in India. Where there is not only a cry, but a rational demand for extended credit, the local board of a taluka, under the recent Acts on self-government, might be allowed to pledge the locality it represents by way of guarantee of a certain percentage of the capital of a proposed popular or agricultural bank. This would greatly facilitate the bank's acquisition of funds; and by enabling it to dispense more aid, would give a spur to enterprise and improvement throughout the circle served by it. Thus helped, secured by a thoroughly good system of registration, and possessing like the Italian popular banks warehouses for the deposit of goods in one or two eligible places, there is no apparent reason why the agrarian bank of a taluka, in correspondence with other like institutions, should not attain prosperity while conferring the benefit of making its circle of constituents more thoughtful, diligent and self-sustaining.

A most effective aid to the agrarian banks of the continent, to which I have already referred, is, in some places, formed on a system which has sprung up and has gained recognition and regulation by law, of capacious storehouses wherein goods may be placed on which it is intended to operate financially without parting with the ownership over them. For the goods deposited the owner takes a receipt, and a warrant for delivery passing by endorsement, and capable by hypothecation. If the owner wants money, as for an advantageous bargain, and the price of his warehoused goods is unfavourable to sale, he can borrow money on the warrant, which is endorsed by him for delivery of the goods to order, or to bearer, failing payment of a sum specified on a day named, or afterwards, on demand at the warehouse. Having parted with the warrant he is not himself allowed to recover the goods on the mere receipt still left in his hands: it serves only as a voucher. On application at the ware-

house on or after the indicated date, the holder of the warrant is entitled to be paid the amount endorsed, or else to receive the goods on payment of storage dues. A short time is allowed to send notice to the owner should he be within reach. Could a system like this be introduced into India considerable benefits would arise from it. The peasant without established credit who is pressed for money just after reaping his crops is constrained to sell at a time when a crowd of other sellers in the same predicament have forced down the market price. A capitalist cannot safely lend to him on his grain, because he cannot be sure it will not be made away with. If he does lend he charges heavily for the risk. Generally the cultivator is forced into the hands of a sowkar, himself very likely a man of but small capital, and driven by his timidity to sell at the wrong time. By the warehousing system the risk of dishonesty and the payment for it are got rid of. The farmer can exercise his own intelligence as to the right moment for selling his produce; and in the meantime he can raise money, if need be, on the warrant. A rate of interest on such a loan which may in itself be a high one is as nothing compared to the fluctuations of a market alternately over and under-stocked. A single warrant can serve as the basis of a dozen transactions, whilst the goods lie undisturbed. A smaller quantity of coin suffices to float the trade of a locality thus provided, and the facility of dealing produces a steadying equalizing effect, which is all in favour of productive unspeculative industry, the sole source of any continuous addition to the general volume of wealth and comfort.

VIII.

The Land Mortgage Banks of Germany have been described by Sir W. Wedderburn in his interesting pamphlet on Agricultural Banks for India. Similar institutions have sprung up in France, Italy, and other countries of the Continent, and even in England, where probably the want of capital was less felt than anywhere else, but where, too, the strict limitations of the ordinary banking system interposed a material obstacle between those who wanted capital for long terms and those who wanted long investments. At present a large mass of English capital flows to the Colonies and to the United States by means of mortgage banks, which borrow on their debentures at English rates, or a little more, and lend at colonial rates. The attempts to introduce the same system into India have been unsuccessful: they hardly could succeed in a community with a very complex set of rights over immoveable property, which strangers could not easily realize. An essential element of success here is local knowledge and interest. If supported by a thorough-going system of land registration as in Prussia, local societies on just such a scale

as to bring the principle of averages fairly into play would probably soon drive all competitors out of the mortgage market. The chief departments of business of the Continental Land Mortgage Banks are—

(1.) To lend on first mortgages to the amount of one-half the estimated market value of the property mortgaged, on terms of repayment of principal and interest by fixed instalments.

(2.) To acquire existing mortgages and allow them to be redeemed by instalments.

(3.) To issue loan notes bearing interest to an amount not exceeding their advances under (1) and (2).

(4.) To open cash credits secured to the allowed maximum by mortgage on the above terms.

(5.) To acquire rent-charges and ascertained claims on Government and public bodies, at their discounted value, giving in payment for them their own notes, or annuities, or placing the amount to the vendor's account current.

The sinking fund arrangement for the extinction of a mortgage may extend over any number of years, from ten to fifty. The loans are usually made in the bank's land-notes, which are secured by its capital and all the properties held by it in mortgage. These notes are discounted either by the land-bank itself or by the ordinary banks, and so converted into cash. The interest charged is in some cases the same as that allowed on the bank's land-notes, generally it exceeds that rate so as to give a reasonable profit. The notes may be so issued payable to the borrower and transferable by endorsement, or to bearer. The borrower may at any time pay off his debt, or part of it by anticipation, and in the bank's land-notes. Every six months so many notes are paid off by drawing as will equal in amount what has been received during the half year towards the extinction of mortgage debts.

In return for the conveniences they afford, the land-banks are generally allowed some special legal privileges. They are freed from the embarrassments of trusts and attachments; they may recover the debts due to them by summary process against the debtors' goods; they enjoy special facilities for eviction or expropriation. It may be feared that in some instances these privileges are used with undue harshness. In the first quarter of 1881 there were in the small kingdom of Bavaria 700 evictions, and of these about 300 were made by the land-banks of various kinds. A less degree of centralization, a larger infusion of local knowledge and interest into the management, would probably have prevented the loans from being granted in most of these cases, and would have averted the necessity for expropriation in many of the others.

The land-banks and the agrarian banks in Italy have hitherto proved far less prosperous than the ordinary popular banks founded

on the Schulze Delitsch principle modified as we have seen. The reasons assigned for this comparative failure are the difficulty of getting their land-notes taken up and discounted in competition with other securities more readily negotiable, the local narrowness of the market for such obligations of any particular institution, the uncertainty of titles to immoveable property, the defects of the cadastral system, the inequalities and ruinous pressure of the land-tax. These would be serious obstacles enough, but to these have been added a great want of uniformity and accord amongst the several institutions and an extreme slowness in disposing of business. Various remedies have been proposed, some of which, as involving over centralization, would almost certainly result in failure. What are most wanted are a complete registration of titles after the Prussian method, and an initial support within reasonable limits by the localities to be benefited and by the State. This assistance can be given either after the Swiss analogy, by a guarantee of the land-banks' obligations up to a certain amount, or by taking up its debentures or land-notes to such an amount. In the case of the State the latter would be the simpler and more effectual method. It would at once relieve the market and present an example of confidence which would have great effect with the timid class of small capitalists. But local knowledge and co-operation are really indispensable to a success that will materially improve the general condition of the people. Saving for the enrichment of the land must be everywhere stimulated even amongst those—a large class—who cannot immediately apply their gains to this purpose, and local intelligence as to the capacities of farms, and of the holders of them seeking advances, must operate in the management of each land-bank or of the branch of it engaging in any particular series of transactions.

It deserves remark, as it does not seem to have been borne in mind, either in Europe or in India, that advances for land improvements and for agricultural operations must bear a due proportion to one another, as otherwise the improved property may be a sort of white elephant for want of the means of making full use of it. In France and Italy, where the earth-hunger of the peasantry amounts to a mania, many men have ruined themselves by raising money from the land-banks in order to add to their holdings by purchases at absurdly high prices. Having thus exhausted their means, they are unable to cultivate with the requisite " intensity," and having to find the periodical instalments for the banks, they are much worse off after their purchase than they were before it. Unless a judicious discrimation be used, it is quite possible for a ryot in India to obtain an advance under the Land Improvement Act of 1883, or from a land-bank, and to be ruined by it because he has not capital with which to work his improved farm. Such capital must be provided, but as the advance of it must in every case be regulated by the

reputation as well as the means of the borrower, it is plain that no cultivator ought to be encouraged either to extend his holdings or to encumber it even for beneficial improvements, beyond his own capacity for management, and his means, reasonably supplemented, of stocking and fertilizing the land. This suggests the necessity of a close communication, if not an identity, between the land-banks and the more strictly agricultural banks in India. It suggests also, what every consideration suggests, that all possible means should be taken to enlist in the service of the credit system as much local intelligence, interest, and influence as can be attracted.

The rent-banks in Prussia constituted by the legislation of 1850, one of the good fruits of the general shaking of Governments in 1848, were designed after the analogy of the earlier Silesian association, and were meant to give full and final effect to Hardenberg's Legislation of 1811. All services to the lords of estates being commuted into money rents payable by the hereditary tenants, these rents were themselves made redeemable at eighteen years' purchase in cash or twenty years' purchase by annual instalments extending over a long term of years, and covering both principal and interest. It would be inconvenient to most land-owners to be thus bought out by a terminable annuity: the rent-bank advanced the twenty years' purchase at once, but in its own notes bearing interest at 4 per cent. It obtained a statutory charge on the land of the tenant (thus made a proprietor) at $4\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 per cent. The tenant had no more to pay than before, yet at the end of 41 or 56 years he would become an unincumbered owner of his holding. Sir W. Wedderburn has observed on this bold and successful measure :—"This sounds almost like jugglery, but in reality it is only good financing." Yet it strikes one as suspicious when "good financing" is declared capable of making $2+2=5$, and the secret in this case lies very near the surface. Eighteen years' purchase implies an interest of about 5·6 per cent. The landlord bought out on such terms and forced to re-invest at 4 per cent., equivalent to 25 years' purchase, would of course be impoverished to the extent of 7·25 of the whole amount paid to him. If the current rate was higher, then he would lose by being forced to take the rent-bank's notes at 4 per cent., for a price implying interest at 5 per cent. Thus the 20 or the 28 per cent. for the redemption sinking fund was taken out of the overlord's pocket; and the financing has no more mysterious efficacy than belongs to an arbitrary though beneficial transfer of property and an accumulation of the sum appropriated at compound interest. In Austria the feudal dues were commuted on terms still less favourable to the lords. Should the analogy of this legislation ever be applied to the extinction of the ryots' debts in India, it must not be supposed that by any cunning device one rupee paid by the debtor can be made two rupees received by the creditor. The question will be, how much may in fairness be

struck off the creditor's claim in considertion of certainty of payment? how far, if at all, may the Government burden the whole of the community with pledges that must be fulfilled, on the chance of recovering as much from the ryots in addition to its present levies? And what must it, or the banks representing it, charge for the transaction so as on the average to prevent any serious loss? Certainly, without good local management, local interest, and local responsibility, it seems almost impossible that the suggested measure should not involve a great hazard of loss to the public, and of further demoralization to the indebted class. For success there must be selection, vigilance and social pressure brought to bear on the part of men who can see a personal damage to themselves in the case of every defaulter. Some aid, some guidance, some effective sanction to well-devised plans it is probably indispensable for the Government to give as it has had to do in every country when a great economical transition has been effected. Its action should be directed not, as it unfortunately has been in the Deccan, to the encouragement of repudiation, and the degradation of the law, but to the stimulation of local independence, and the support of institutions which will ere long stand by themselves, and probably more than repay the services they have received.

IX.

The historian Grote observes on the foolish and false philosophy of those in his generation, who, when in Greek history they found some occurrence which startled them by its strangeness, proceeded to account for it by imagining a capricious instability and want of sense in the Greek people which would necessarily have precluded them from taking the great place they fill in the drama of human evolution. His own work was based on the opposite assumption, that granting certain fundamental notions peculiar to themselves in the region of things unproveable, the Greeks were as rational and consistent in their circumstances, and with reference to their standards, as any modern community. One is reminded of the ludicrous assumptions that Grote censures, and forced to think of the real prevalence of human characteristics amongst men, when scheme after scheme is brought forward in India by officials of at least average ability for the reform of evils which are referred to relations and characteristics that would sever the Hindoos widely from other sections of the human race. At one moment they are supposed to be like a pack of wilful and mischievous children; at another they are denied the sympathies on which mutual consideration and fair dealing rest; and, again, they are presumed to be at once so intellectually feeble as to be quite incapable of understanding their own interests,

and looking after them, and yet morally so strong, so superior to the rest of the world, that they—the poor and ignorant tillers of the soil —can resist temptations that would overcome the constancy of any other people. It was a fancy of their early writers that the holiness of some sages was so great that it could pass untainted through what for others would be a degrading immorality. In these modern days an equal virtue is by implication assigned by one "statesman" to the same people whom the next statesman or legislator that comes on the scene pronounces unfit, perhaps, for the common functions of justice. In one thing only all, or nearly all, the *ex officio* statesmen agree. Each one thinks that he holds the key to native character and Indian difficulties, inscrutable to all others. He has his "system," as infallible as that of any gamester at San Carlo; and his powerful hands are formed expressly to mould the character and the destinies of the two hundred and fifteen millions. Sometimes he is allowed to have his will. The brilliant plan, it is then found, will not work, or works with results the reverse of what were expected. Still it is never the constructive genius that is at fault; it is the mean administrators. There would be some retort, but that the author of "the great and beneficent measure" is a man with a very large "figure of merit," or, at any rate, of fortune, whom loyalty of the adulterine Indian sort guards against refutation. When the great man has been borne to the official tomb by a P. & O. steamer, another reputation is waiting to be made. The millions need another plastic hand; and once more the tranquil denizen who outstays five years may enquire.

Amphora coepit
Institui; currente rota cur urceus exit?

Amongst the people themselves in the meantime a feeling arises that caprice and unreason are their masters' attributes: that all government is unstable as the "baseless fabric of a vision." Foolish hopes are cherished of a government *deus ex machina* to clear away all difficulties. The reverence born of time attends no institution as change follows change—no institution save that of the native law which stands majestic in the people's regard behind this pother of reform—immutable, or slowly changing in the lapse of uncounted generations, and so ever preserving a sacred continuity.

This contempt for experimenters may be forgiven to the Hindoo since it was shared by Dr. Johnson; and dropping the reproach of "unaccountableness," so easily and exasperatingly bandied to and fro, we shall find that "Asiatics" to be governed "Asiatically" must be governed, as Europeans are governed "Europeanly," by crediting them with a fair share of common sense mixed with some in congruous notions, and by adapting our measures to their particular stage of progress, a different one from our own it may be, and somewhat of our road, but not one incapable of comprehension. Some study, indeed, of the character of the Southern Europeans shows that there is more

than a slight degree of resemblance produced by likeness of circumstances between them and the ryots of the Indian fields. If the one peasantry is all within the circle of political science, the other cannot be all without it. Principles must be applicable, and whims of shallow cleverness inapplicable, to both alike.

In the South of Italy, and still more in Sicily, the most striking feature in the social relations of the people is the utter subservience of the poorer class to the richer. Self-restraint, and a reasonable consideration for the rights of others are in the rich signs of unusual benevolence rather than a common duty exacted by general expectation. This tyranny and submission to tyranny is the chief support of the wretched economical condition of the country. It leads to perpetual despotic intermeddling, to capricious and ignorant interferences, prohibitions, and commands on the part of the comparatively wealthy and powerful, which at every point check the free action of the industrial population. In such a state of things enterprise is stifled, any emergence from poverty becomes almost impossible, intelligence and emulation are a curse, and the moral character of the people, high and low, is subjected to a continual depravation. Slavery tempered by brigandage is the social law; and it has been found that members even of the upper class have joined in the rascalities of the *mafia* and *camorra*. Such is the result to which a radically unsound system of credit has led, or at least has largely contributed. Usury avowed and secret has eaten up the heart and the hope of the rural population. Misery has driven then to crime; and in the utter waste of power caused by an ill-ordered management of capital the country is deprived of the use of one-half at least of its productive capacity. The remedy must, as all competent observers agree, have a direct relation to the disease. Usurers and those who, having social power, naturally abuse it, are not to be hanged or transported, they are to be met, and superseded, and reduced to their proper places, by the competition of a better system, of institution, springing from the frugality and industry of the people themselves, by which their hard-earned gains will be husbanded, and form a reservoir of capital from which the free cultivator may draw according to his needs on the undegrading conditions merely of an attested fitness as a borrower, and of honest punctuality in repayment.

The reflexions just placed before the reader are those of accomplished observers on a European population. They may surely find an application in Asia. The Italian peasant over-worked, over-taxed, bullied, and ill-fed, might often envy the lot of the Indian ryot with slender means; true; but also with small needs; seldom toiling so hard, and still seldomer worried by a heartless task-master, himself the slave in turn of heartless usurers. Yet with an almost savage pressure the work got out of the Italian labourer has but about six-tenths of the efficiency of that rendered by the English ploughman. In India

the comparative efficiency has not, I believe, been accurately tested; but it is obviously far less. Allowance made for the climate, far more work could be done, and would be done, with better wages, and more skilled direction. These in India, as in Europe, imply accessible capital, and an open path for ability. Nor let it be said in India, any more than in Europe, that thrift and the marvellous fruits of thrift are an impossibility. In Germany and France it has been pertinently asked, "how came the present middle class by the ample means on which the structure of modern civilization mainly rests?" Not by any miraculous gift of abundance, nor by any extraordinary endowment of ability. The toiling burghers of the middle ages were not much assisted by the governing class of feudal gentry, who at every opportunity harried and crushed them. Prices were not regulated, nor was the coinage debased in their interest. Yet after all, their patience and persistence conquered. In the end they subdued their circumstances. In India many have done the same; why not more? The bad traditions of a past of violence and lawlessness no doubt still affect the common notions of the people. Their very constitution has through hereditary transmission been in some degree tainted by contact with the vices that fester in anarchy. But now who comes to plunder the poor man's cottage, or to lay waste his ripening fields? The material elements of prosperity are not wanting; peace and good government according to a reasonable standard prevail. The mass, however, can seldom or never move without leaders; their movement, indeed, would be a mere chaos. It is the educated and wealthy who, being capable of grasping the new conditions of their age, owe it to their countrymen to provide them with aid that would no longer be thrown away, to extend the guiding hand, and win disciples to the invigorating gospel of organized self-help.

If there is not in the Hindoo nature anything so eccentric and abnormal as to make general principles inapplicable to it, only a special history of India that has left peculiar associations, and a particular stage of industrial transition to be taken into account in considering the possibilities of progress, there are at the same time many circumstances to encourage the economical reformer. The main principles of credit are tolerably well known, though practice lags behind the requirements of this new time. India has from time immemorial had a banking system of its own, which, indeed, but two or three centuries ago, was decidedly in advance of that of Europe. The *invention* of bills of exchange, on which European economists have dwelt as one of the greatest instruments in the development of commerce, was really an introduction to the West, through the Arabs and Jews, of the system of remittance by *hoondies* which can be traced back in India to a much earlier period. The same may indeed be said of insurance; while in the *havâlat* by which a Hindoo covers his friend's or client's proposed transactions we may see a principle widely received

into the mercantile custom of Europe, and even passing by the same Arabic name. The cash credit system of the Scotch banks had in a way been anticipated centuries before by the practice of Indian sowkars. The progress of the Europeans in all these departments has now left the Hindoo far behind; but the rudiments of credit as the great vehicle of commerce still exist in the country of their origin. The improved variety will grow well in the ancestral soil if the conditions of its growth and preservation be but carefully studied and attended to. Perfect good faith, care, and discrimination in dispensing capital, must be accompained by the exaction of a punctual and strict performance of their obligations on the part of debtors. The discipline will to many be a severe one, and final success implies a considerable change of character, or at least of habits, amongst large classes of the people; but no one need despair of such a change who has read history to good purpose; and in the present state of the world it is in the economical sphere, and in those immediately connected with it, that the most effective means can be found, not only for the material but for the intellectual and moral advancement of nations. Implicit mutual trust, the capacity for combination, the habit of prevision, the recognition of poverty and wealth as governed by inevitable law—all these and other lessons of humanity and wisdom may best be learned in the great school of economical philosophy for which the transactions of every day afford pertinent examples. In such studies the Hindoo pupil if well taught may yet recover the foremost place, or at any rate a high proficiency.

X.

In the remarks which in the preceding papers I have offered on the organization of credit in Europe and its relations to economical progress, I have dwelt only on those new institutions which, by providing for comparatively humble people, furnish a possible pattern, or at least useful suggestions, for the establishment and extension of credit in India. Banks of the ordinary type, and their mode of working, are so well known as not to need discussion. That they will not serve the purposes of the mofussil is sufficiently shown by the failure of the many existing banks to push their business except in a few centres of great trade. For persons of slender means there is precisely the same difficulty of access to the ordinary banks that there was in Germany; but this very difficulty has made the humbler banks successful there, and might have the same effect here. Credit unions and agrarian banks would probably add to the business of the greater concerns by giving increased facility to the minor operations of industry, and by keeping money circulating in the districts that would otherwise be lost to them. An elaborate centralized system of banks, with its head office at Calcutta or Bombay, inevitably draws to its centre

retains and employs there, a large portion of the funds collected by its branches. If it is tempted to engage in speculations in exchange, loans, or stock-jobbing, the chances of disastrous loss are great. Success itself may well be a misfortune to the country clients whose petty needs seem contemptible beside the gigantic operations of speculative finance. From such temptations a local association is free. It can pursue its humble but useful course without distraction, and with a single eye to the wants and the benefit of its small group of associates and customers.

Let us turn now to the means whereby an extension of credit may be encouraged by provisions for clearness of security and prompt recovery from defaulters. Amongst the means most effectual for giving security to the lender, and so easing the terms on which the borrower supplies his needs, is a complete registration of titles. In Australia the Torrens Act went far towards supplying this desideratum; and in some of the United States a tolerably complete system of registration of deeds has given simplicity and security to transfers and incumbrances of real property. In England several systems of registration are in operation. The Yorkshire registration law has been recast and made more effectual in the last session of Parliament. It seems to have been improved on the pattern of the effective system established in Ireland, one which affords a very fair safeguard to titles except in so far as it has been corroded by the action of the Courts. Cavillers might possibly complain that in India, as in England, the purpose of the legislature, and the protective operation of the Registration Acts as literally construed, have been somewhat frustrated by qualifications imported from English equity; but notwithstanding any such constructions, the effect of the Acts has been to make transactions in real property much easier and safer than before. What is needed is a complete conception of the principle on which this legislation rests; and a bolder and wider application of it than any to which our law-makers have yet braced themselves. In dealing with this as with other subjects the "architectonic" minds to which constructive legislation has been committed in India have been reduced to hesitation, and a certain pettiness of movement, by conscious unacquaintance with the special circumstances and needs of this country. Those, on the other hand, who teem with local knowledge and provincial sympathy are generally so innocent of jurisprudence, and of the art of framing a statute, that they can rarely pour their wealth of experience into the mould of a clear symmetrical and useful law. We blunder on from point to point, and achieve a certain progress as the mean result of continual aberrations.

Sir Henry Maine, in one of his lectures a few years ago, announced to the British public, as a kind of discovery, the existence in some countries of the continent of a system of compulsory registration of titles. He then went on to show the supposed analogy of this

method to the declaration in the face of the feudal or pre-feudal community by which a transfer of titles was at once authenticated and ratified; and concluded by a forecast of the elimination from the law of the future of large sections dealing with the conflict of rights to land. A glance at the French law reports does not encourage such an expectation, as it shows that "inscription," "transcription," and their consequences, are a fruitful source of litigation. This is due in a measure to the halting legislation on the subject; and had the German registration laws been drawn, as Sir H. Maine supposes, from this French source, they would probably have reproduced the defects of the original, and have been of more doubtful benefit. The real source of the German laws was one of Frederick the Great promulgated in 1783, which, by amendments made in 1873, has become thoroughly effective for its purpose. It secures the registration of every interest in fixed property, by prescribing that none but registered titles shall be recognized; and provides as an essential element of every transaction, as affecting the real right, that it shall be registered, accessibly recorded, and specific. The working of the system is conducted by a special department, whose experts have to be satisfied by their own investigations, or by a judicial order, before they make any entry operating as a conveyance or mortgage, so far at any rate as third parties are concerned. The system is most effective, but after the German fashion, it attains its end by a dilatory and elaborate process, which is only one degree less harassing than the alternative uncertainty and litigation.

Various steps have been taken in England in the direction of a general registration of titles. Lord Westbury's Act proved practically abortive; but the statutes of 1862 and 1876 enable those who desire it to procure indefeasible titles. In Scotland every incumbrance or change of title is recorded in local and central registers on a system which might with some changes of detail be introduced with great advantage into India. But no system can be complete and thorough-going which does not exact, or at least allow, an initial declaration and record of all existing titles, and give an indisputable ownership to him who has fulfilled precautionary requirements. The unquestionable title given by the Landed Estates Court in Ireland is (or was) so highly valued, that many properties were thrown into the court merely in order to gain this security. The recent English legislation to which we have adverted goes a long way in the same direction, and is thus much in advance of our Indian law on the same subject. When the subject is taken up again by the Simla parliament, we may hope that the result will be a really comprehensive and far-reaching measure, grounded on a wide study of what has been done, not only in England, but in Europe at large, in a department wherein England for various reasons offers a pattern far more defective than that presented by most other civilized countries.

The details of a perfect system of registration do not admit of discussion here ; they are too minute and technical for popular treatment. It will be enough to suggest that the Revenue Survey maps of villages and towns might well and inexpensively be made the basis of registration, which in its minuter elements had better rest on the distinction of properties as originally entered. Divisions of such a property to any degree of minuteness could be recorded, with continued reference to the number originally assigned to it, by means of a decimal interpolation for each fragment. Another practical aid of importance, when a full registration had once been made, would be a report exacted from the local officials of the death of a registered owner or incumbrancer, and of the existence of infants having an interest in the property left by the deceased. With good legislation, and good management, the record of private rights and of the cadastral survey might be so brought together as to enormously facilitate both private transactions and the administrative work of the Government.

The Scottish law provides not only for the registration of titles to land, but also of personal obligations. A bond or note is thus given the effect of a confession of judgment; and execution may be had on it without the delay and expense of a suit. This procedure has this advantage over the new summary suit on a bill of exchange under the English law, imitated in the Indian Code of Civil Procedure, that a person applied to for a loan, on a promise or a hypothecation of moveable property, can by means of the register ascertain whether there is any one already in a position to intercept his remedy against the proposed borrower and his property. Should the true and simple principle be recognized, that certainty of right and remedy is a material element of cheap credit, we may in this respect, as in others, get a useful suggestion from a law of which English lawyers are for the most part profoundly, and not very creditably, ignorant.

XI.

It is a rule with nearly all the popular banks in Europe that in lending on mortgage they will not accept as security any property held in joint tenancy by brothers or other relatives. It has been found by experience, that where several persons are interested as owners, or part owners, in the same property through mutual family relations, the probabilities of litigation are so great that prudent mortgagees ought not to look at it. In India the case is still worse. The law of the Hindu family, mingling itself with the law of property in a thousand entanglements, is so varied by caste and local custom, that unexpected claims are always springing up, and causing infinite disputes. The English courts, and the highest court perhaps more than any other, are continually engaged in building up, beside the

Hindu law, a structure of incongruous elements, taken partly from that law, partly from the English law, partly from a law of nature or general equity, which, as Grotius pointed out, is but the national law generalized. The English system of working wholly upon precedents is admirably adapted for keeping up a historical connexion between the old law and the new, and as the intellectual movements of the judges, as of other men, are imperceptibly swayed by the prevailing currents of thought and moral emotion in their own age, the living law becomes a grave reflex of the people's growth. But the same method, applied to a wholly alien system of law, leads to incongruous and contradictory results. There is no living consciousness of the common law diffused as a medium in which the bench and the bar are immersed, no tone of thought thus produced, which makes certain views and decisions felt as wrong, and causes them to be quietly explained away or set aside as foreign matter incapable of assimilation. Men (being men) who can pronounce finally with or without reason on matters which it is possible they should quite understand contract a certain spirit of dogmatic arrogance, and comment with humiliating asperity on any gentle attempt at independence of thought in a lower sphere. It is not too much to say that under such influences the law of the courts in India is every year diverging more widely in some respects from the true law of the people which those courts profess to administer. It must be so in the absence of a well constituted, vigorous, and educated public opinion. Such an opinion would ere now have called for a select central court in India for dealing with collisions of principle in the ordinary courts, and ere confusion deepened into gross contradictions of principle, it would have demanded a cleaving by statute of the knots tied with perverted ingenuity by the law courts.

We have to deal here only with the economical effects of the state of things just glanced at; but it is plain that these effects must be in an extreme degree obstructive to a due expansion of credit. It is hardly to be expected, however, that our legislation will for this generation adopt any such thorough-going reform as I have suggested. It is apt to be bold and timid in the wrong place and to put up its guard superfluously after it has through carelessness received a blow. Such being the character of the legislation, it is at the same time almost beyond possibility that it should ever have the continued systematic guidance of members really at home in the Hindu or Mahomedan law, or keenly perceptive of the range and force of native custom. Under such circumstances the suggestion may be made as a practical escape from growing embarrassments, that any native subject of Her Majesty may, by a declaration duly made and registered, acquire the common status as to property contemplated by Act X. of 1865.

A Hindu or Mahomedan who chooses to abandon his faith may gain this advantage at present; and in a well-ordered state sound

proprietary relations ought not to be dependent on the religion of the subject. Nor, indeed, it must be admitted, ought the law to which one is subject to be a matter of choice ; but, then, it *is* a matter of choice ; all that can be done immediately is to improve the conditions of choice, and in providing such a way through the stages of transition our legislators would be acting on the lessons of history presented by Europe in its passage from mediæval to modern life.

The adoption of a status in the manner thus suggested should, of course, be quite optional. Precautions should be taken against its injuring existing rights. There should be no retraction. It should make no change within the religious and ceremonial sphere. The children of a man who had acquired the common status would stand to him in the relation substantially of English children to their fathers, except as the equal right of succession enjoyed by all in the absence of a will.

The economical advantage of such a measure as the one just suggested would be this, that the head of a family would acquire complete control over its estate. This would really be a return, for Hindus, to their earlier law ; and on the whole there is no doubt that their worldly concerns would prosper most under the direction generally of a father's mature intelligence. The small proprietor thus qualified could offer to the capitalist the security of a title arising from relations created by an intelligible simple statute which the courts can construe and apply with uniformity according to known principles. The advantages, indeed, arising from this source would be so great that a good deal of social pressure would be brought to bear on loan seekers to adopt the proposed status ; and in the course of a generation we might see an almost complete but tranquil revolution effected, which would remove some of the most serious obstacles that stand in the way of material progress. A check on the inordinate reproduction of feeble families by withdrawing legal sanction from the marriages of boys under eighteen would have its economical value also ; but the discussion of this thorny subject cannot be pursued here.

The evils arising from an indefinite sub-division of the land, or even of rights over the land, are so great and obvious that some continental economists have been led to call out for an introduction of the English system of succession. It certainly offends one's sentiment when one of several sons takes the whole patrimony, but this does not really occur in most cases except by the will of the father, who now enjoys under the English law almost unbounded liberty of disentailing. The father on whom the welfare of the whole family, their education, professions, social relations and connexions must needs depend, may well be entrusted, say the writers in question, with the disposal of his property by will, and, failing such disposition, the law may well dispose of the estate in the way most contributory to the general progress of the community in economical efficiency.

Although the English law of primogeniture (so-called) is much condemned on the ground of unfairness, it is at least reasonably maintainable that the system is one that throws more energy into production than the laws of equal distribution that prevail on the continent and in India. An English manufacturer keeps so many of his sons in his own business as it will easily sustain; the others he sets up in business or professions for themselves. A farmer or small proprietor having three sons, and knowing that his land will provide well for only one family, takes care to start his younger sons either on farms of their own, or in some other line of life, and for this end saves and spares during many years. He has to live more frugally during this time, but each of his sons is set forth on an independent career. On the continent the sons generally remain in the paternal home until the father's death, or at least far more frequently than in England. Their equal rights lead them to a partition of interests; and the son who takes the property takes it saddled with heavy rent-charges in favour of his brothers. It is possible, no doubt, to discount these arrangements. One son may be set up in France or Germany, and another take the patrimonial lands; but the general practice favoured by the law is otherwise. It is easy to see that the young Englishman, driven forth to seek his fortune, is much more powerfully stimulated to productiveness than the young Frenchman waiting for a share of the family estate, of which his father, who has acquired it, cannot deprive him. The evil is provided against by the French people in ways which French politicians are beginning to deplore; but in Germany multiplication goes on at much the same rate as in England, and the consequence is a continued impoverishment of the agricultural class.

An article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of the 7th July 1881, quoted by Sir R. Blennerhasset in the *Fortnightly Review*, gives a picture of the ordinary condition of the German peasant proprietor. His whole returns amount to £20 or £21 sterling a year. For taxes, and interest on loans, he has to pay £10 or £11. On the remaining £10 or £11 he has to support his family of five children. The rent-charges in favour of his brothers and sisters take away from the average small proprietor in Germany more than the net profit left for the maintenance of his own family. There is not much here for the ordinary ryot to envy, but in India causes substantially the same lead in one way or another to similar results. The perpetual fissation of interests, even though the property be not distributed in specie, is a great obstacle to progress, by depriving the land of capital, and by keeping three or four peasants hanging about a holding which could be worked by one. Where the fields are actually divided the evil is still greater. The waste of labour and the obstacles to improvement thus created on the continent of Europe have, as we have seen, forced many economists, in spite of all their social predilections, to ask for

a law of singular succession, as the only effective bulwark against a gradual pauperization of the peasantry. In India it would not be necessary to go so far; an option accorded to the people of assuming the common status under Act X. of 1865, with the accompanying testamentary power, would probably be eagerly embraced by thousands in every rank, and especially by cultivators anxious to have the disposal of their small farms in their own hands, and aware that the agricultural joint family usually ends in poverty, dissension and disruption.

XII.

Next after clearness of title as a means of facilitating credit comes certainty and promptness of recovery. This is a conclusion against which sentiment in individual cases often rebels; and is one of the later fruits of systematic thought. Our Indian legislature has not as yet quite reached it. In its dealing with incumbered estates it has, not without strong reasons, departed widely on political grounds from the course that economic science suggested. The Deccan Agriculturists' Act reproduces and exaggerates some of the favourite doctrines of Proudhon. He was for extinguishing interest and rent, but he approved of stringent laws for the recovery of principal. The Act in question cuts off in many cases interest and principal alike by the most exasperating of all means, the imposition retrospectively of conditions which it must generally be impossible to satisfy, and by putting impediments in the way of execution which make a decree little better than waste paper. Such a measure must needs ruin or half ruin many small capitalists. It must just as certainly demoralize the peasantry. It may be doubted if any population in the world could resist a temptation distinctly held out to them by law to repudiating debts and evading the fulfilment of burdensome obligations. The natural consequence of this state of the law must be to drive capital bit by bit to places in which it can be used with more safety, and, as capital departs, to raise the price of accommodation to every struggling agriculturist who, with the aid of cheap capital, might have made some definite addition to his means of livelihood and to the resources of the country. It is not to be doubted that some relief was necessary, nor could some sacrifices on the part of the moneyed class be dispensed with. They had by degrees made themselves virtual overlords of the peasantry; and a re-establishment of social equilibrium involved some disturbance of their legal rights, as in the analogous case of the feudal gentry of Germany and Austria. But the requisite interferences and sacrifices should have been referred to and limited by high principles of public need. To hold out a premium to cheating and evasion, to make the solemn process of the law an instrument of unconscientiousness, and its

decrees a laughing-stock, was surely to foster dishonesty and recklessness to-day, to be followed by penury and helplessness to-morrow.

The old basis of legislation on the relations of lender and borrower was a conception of the latter as a weak and helpless creature requiring special safeguards, and entitled to indulgences, which made the position of the lender quite uncertain unless he kept a proportionally large sum by him to provide against contingencies. Yet for every delay, and for every capricious denial of his right to the creditor by a judge wholly ignorant, perhaps, of the science of finance, the debtor had to pay. Bankers of independent spirit and conscious uprightness in dealing will not submit to the whimsical and exasperating obstacles placed in their way by an ignorant functionary or legislature. They transfer their capital elsewhere, not by a single operation, which, on account of current engagements, is generally impossible, but in parts as opportunities occur. Thus money gravitates more and more to the principal centres, while the extremities suffer from a paralysing anæmia. The sums which the banker has to keep by him are in the first place withdrawn from circulation, and by lessening the competition of lenders raise the general rate of interest. In the second place they are wholly unproductive to their owner, who must consequently, in order to realize an average profit equivalent to his risk, add to the rate on the money he lends in proportion to the reserve he is forced to maintain. If such a system then prevails, it is inevitable that capital should be expelled from the districts that most need it. The way to ensure an abundant supply of capital is to simplify and facilitate the recovery of advances. This does not imply the encouragement of imposition and overreaching: it implies the exercise of searching discrimination between the cases in which the borrower and the lender stand on an equal footing, and those in which the borrower is ignorant and unadvised in the presence of selfish astuteness, a helpless suppliant at the feet of the sowkar. Such a discrimination the courts ought to exercise, but society is bound to reduce the need for it to a minimum. Agrarian loan societies on the mutual principle, without any temptation to defraud, with every inducement to lend, or to refuse to lend, on sound and beneficial principles, might safely be accorded summary powers of recovery that could not be entrusted to the ordinary creditor. To them the best class of agriculturists would almost without exception resort, until the present ignoble vassalage of the borrower to the lender had ceased along with the causes that gave rise to it. It may be asserted with some confidence that no other remedy holds out a substantial promise of success. Legislative condemnations and penal laws still maintained in all their stringency on the continent of Europe have failed to extirpate usury. They have but made its exactions more cruel. In the East and centre of Europe the peasantry have been freed from feudal serfdom only to become in too many cases the slaves of the

usurer. The Jew is the Marwarree of those regions ; and the outrages to which the unhappy Israelites have been subjected in Russia and Hungary prove how a false economical system—false in its want of adaptation to the people's stage of progress—may annihilate respect for the law, and undermine the foundations of social order.

A survey of recent economical history, at the same time, if it teaches anything, teaches that an ignorant peasantry inheriting traditions of improvidence are never fit to be entrusted in a moment with full proprietary rights and complete liberty to dissipate them. The purest air will suffocate if the organism is not yet formed to breathe in it. There is an intermediate stage, as Stein recognized in his great land reforms, at which the protection of the State is necessary for the preservation of small holdings. This was at least equally the case in India ; and the failure to recognize it was a defect in the Bombay Revenue Survey, which has had serious consequences. The reserve to an agriculturist as a subject of the State of such a quantum of land as will feed him takes the place of a poor law. But even beyond this all hypothecations of land should be vigilantly watched, and subjected to regulations that will give to debtor and creditor a perfectly defined position. The extended need for money in his daily transactions, and his access to money in an advanced system, are a difficulty and a temptation too great in many instances for undisciplined faculty of management and self-restraint. Regard being had to the but partly-developed capacity of an Indian peasant for economic autonomy, it would probably be well, for a time at any rate, to restrict the right of taking mortgages of agricutural land to well-organized societies, wherever such societies can be formed with a sufficient proportion of local members. The interference with free competition would be justified by great social gains, and need not be prolonged beyond a few years. In that time the sowkar of the inferior type would be drawn in or driven out. He would lose his last means of oppression by the abolition of imprisonment for debt.

The abolition of imprisonment for debt involves, however, a set of considerations which extend much further than this single conclusion. When it is said that the creditor is to blame for trusting a pauper, the answer is that the debtor may have got rid of his property by dishonesty or recklessness, which the prospect of imprisonment tends to check. So far as this fear does operate, it obviously benefits the borrower by diminishing the increased interest demanded for insurance. But when compulsion by taking a debtor's goods and by taking his body are compared, the difference is obvious. The man who has goods evidently can so far pay ; the man who has not, can pay only by his labour ; and to put him into gaol deprives society of his productive exertions. Only in cases of fraud and contumacy can the gain

of the example be worth to the community all that it costs, and in such cases the punishment should be imposed under the public law, not as a gratification of personal revenge on the part of the creditor, which turns the sympathies of the multitude against the law. Most cases of imprisonment for debt are in truth experimental. The hidden property of the debtor is sometimes brought out; but more frequently the tenderness of his relatives is abused: they pay the creditor, and are brought so much nearer to the level of their improvident brother or cousin.

But even in the case of the man who has goods or land, a certain reserve must, from the economical point of view, be made in allowing execution against property as against the person. A man's capacity for work avails nothing without some productive object on which to exercise it. If, therefore, he is stripped of the only object on which he can work with effect, he is made a fruitless incumbrance just as surely as by being condemned to absolute inactivity. His liberty is a mere mockery if he cannot on any terms obtain a share in the bounties of nature. But can he work as a labourer? Yes, if any one wants his services; but society, which has allowed the appropriation of all natural agents, has not annexed a condition of employment for every casual pauper; and amongst a class of petty proprietors the call for extraneous aid occurs but occasionally. Along then with the peasant's freedom of person the State should, in the case of the ryot, guard his possession and use of such a minimum area of land as by its culture may afford him profitable occupation, or at any rate save him from mendicancy. It should also refuse to forfeit his hut, his implements, and his food in the interest of his creditor. The common sympathies of our race, which condemn slavery even of the improvident, must, when sufficiently enlightened, equally condemn the liberty given to a man who cannot swim by throwing him into the deep sea and bidding him go where he will.

XIII.

It has been less the object of this series of papers to suggest or lead up to any specific mode of practical action than to draw attention to what has been done elsewhere, and to gather from it, so far as might be, some encouragements to a further study of the subject by those who have the means and influence for turning the lessons thus to be learned to account. The support of the Government is never to be disdained, especially its co-ordinative action in giving form and regulation to a popular wish or conviction, which must get into operation uniformly and massively or not at all; but the one thing needful for Indian reformers in the economic field is the spirit of self-reliance. This it is which has done and is doing so much in Europe amongst populations still sunk too often in ignorance and poverty,

and this it is which in the main must be the great basis of improvement in India. But to self-reliance the leaders of the proposed reform must add patience and completeness of investigation. When the great step has to be taken from study and theory to practice, there must be not only a complete assimilation of the teaching that Europe affords, but an acquired mastery, or an intuitive perception of the conditions under which the problem of progress and expansion presents itself in India. There is no law of social policy or progress but requires special modifications to adapt it to specific national and local characteristics. Caste is an element; such too are the family system, the laws of inheritance, the force of custom, the physical enervation, and the general want of enterprise amongst the people. A new spirit has to be awakened, to use new means, and meet new exigencies. There is room for the exercise of various talents and accomplishments in preparing for the better future; and it is to be hoped that education in this department will have its army of apostles when the teaching of books and of the school has had its turn.

The financial history of India or any province of India has yet to be written. It would need a native Adam Smith to trace out with precision all the causes that have determined in any important section of the country the rise and the decline of material prosperity. Some of the influences that have been at work are too obvious to escape notice, but the most profitable lessons do not lie so much on the surface. Peace and safety have not always brought a great increase of comfort and contentment. The reasons for this are worth ascertaining and explaining. In searching for them the competent explorer would probably arrive at many secondary propositions of the utmost value for the purpose we are now considering. In all schemes for improving the system of credit in any country or province, careful regard must be paid to the actual development of its productive and mercantile capacities, to the economical characteristics of its people, and to the existing means and methods of credit. The organization of trade may in one province be such as to afford scope for the highest forms of banking, while in another the attempt to force an advanced system of credit and circulation on a population not prepared for it would be fruitless or disastrous. The refinements of credit should not probably be aimed at until the lower stages of evolution and discipline have been passed through. The existing system, however defective, should be studied, as having necessarily by long contact grown into some kind of adaptation to the needs and the peculiarities of the people, who themselves, by hereditary habit, have come to accept the burdens and obstacles it imposes as a part of the order of nature. The sowkar's influence must be recognized; his knowledge and skill must, if possible, be enlisted in the cause of improvement. In all these particulars local associations of credit, acting independently on their own responsibility, are likely to have a

great advantage over any centralized system worked under inflexible orders. Still greater must be their superiority to Government institutions with rules, in order to prevent fraud, so rigid and elaborate, as to deprive them of all beneficial capacity. An expansion of the existing system being necessary, that expansion should be made tentatively, with a careful selection of parties and a continual scrutiny of results. Thus discipline would advance along with expansion, and the more powerful weapons of finance would be taken up only by hands trained by practice to wield them.

Subject to such variations as a more thorough investigation of the matter may prove to be necessary, it seems that a good beginning might be made by establishing in each of the chief towns of a few districts a Popular Bank, or Credit Union, on principles substantially the same as those on which similar institutions rest in Europe. Such a bank would serve at once as a savings bank, as a loan bank for trade, and in a limited way an agricultural bank for the surrounding district. To make it thoroughly efficient as an agrarian taluka or tehsil bank, it ought to be placed on the footing to be presently considered. In some large places, such as Poona and Ahmedabad, the District Popular Bank might well find enough to do with its capital and deposits without entering on the field proper to an agrarian bank. In that case a taluka bank might stand beside it, not so much in rivalry as in the exercise of mutual support. The district bank thus constituted would be the centre of communication and interchange for the several small taluka banks of the zillah. Enjoying a greater variety of business than these, and a much greater proportion of business not agricultural, it would work in a more continuous circle, taking some of their superfluous cash from the taluka banks in their dead season, and lending them some of its own money when they needed it at the seasons of sowing and carrying the crops. A certain round of business, with one section becoming active as another grows dull, is necessary to profitable banking at moderate rates ; an agrarian bank, with an intermittent flow and ebb of transactions, ought, therefore, to be in intimate connexion with others whose customers are mostly of the trading or industrial class.

A new law would be requisite to put the proposed Popular Banks with variable capital on a secure legal basis. The best model, though not one to be followed without qualification, would probably be found in the Belgian Statute of 1873 on the organization of mercantile associations. The present Indian Companies Act takes little or no account of the special needs of India even within its own sphere, and for the purposes of Popular Banks would be found only embarrassing. It is but a stucco monument to the genius of its promoter, resembling the Lucknow architecture in its flimsy and servile imitativeness and its disregard for solid indigenous materials. The Swiss Federal Code Title XXVII. is perhaps still better than the Belgian

law ; but it has not been so long subjected to the strain of work and criticism. The principles of the two are identical.

Should a district bank be founded on a sufficiently extensive scale, an important part of its functions would, after a time, consist in encouraging local combination and enterprise for industrial purposes. By joint stock companies on a moderate scale and by co-operative associations, effecting a more economical and fruitful division and combination of labour, Indian manufacturers may in many instances be enabled to compete once more with the productions of foreign countries. But care and foresight must be exercised in giving aid to local undertakings, not to involve a popular bank too deeply in any single enterprise. According to the European examples its engagements of this kind must be rigorously limited to a certain proportion of its reserve.

It is probable that, if the first two or three district banks that are started are tolerably well managed, no need will be felt by others of any extraneous assistance. But in the first instance the Government, if it recognizes the important and beneficial aims of a district bank, and is satisfied of the soundness of its financial basis, may most properly support it either by becoming a sharer with limited liability, or else by taking up a number of its debentures at the same rate of interest at which they are issued to private investors. The confidence of the public in the concern would thus be much increased ; and when the bank had attained a position of assured stability the Government could sell its debentures in the market. Should the bank be an agrarian bank also, the pressing need of agricultural development would justify a larger investment of Government funds, and a local guarantee, as in the case of the other taluka banks. The Currency Commissioners have large sums at their disposal, and they might, without any real risk but with a considerable gain, be empowered to employ 10 or 20 per cent. of these funds in the purchase of obligations of the district and taluka banks recommended by the provincial Governments.

When a certain stage of progress has been reached in the development of district banks of the class we have been considering, an appropriate and profitable investment for a portion of their funds will doubtless be found in supplying money to the various local authorities whose demands for the construction of roads, public buildings, and the like, must inevitably increase in the near future. The system of Government loans to municipalities and other public bodies, at rates of interest lower than those at which the same money could be obtained from capitalists, is hardly to be defended in principle. It makes the whole community virtually answerable for the blunders of a corporation. If money can be raised on the credit of the State at lower rates than by a local authority which needs the money, the public, which warrants the repayment, should have the benefit of the difference

of interest. The suggestion that the State loses nothing is illusory; it assumes a risk which ought to be paid for, and the money lent would enable it to take its own stock off the market, and thus, by raising the price, empower it to stipulate for a reduced rate of interest to the public creditor. Lastly, the opportunity of obtaining money at a rate so much lower than they have been used to and than what is proper in the common opinion with respect to the security they have to offer, is a strong temptation to corporations to indulge in extravagance. The increase in English local indebtedness in the last generation is quite portentous, far exceeding the reduction of the public debt, and a great part of this vast additional burden has been contracted under the impulse of semi-gratuitous loans from the public purse. These are in reality but applications of Proudhon's principle of the State's finding money free of interest for the promotion of every beneficial object. On the Continent the increase of communal and civic debts has been far greater even than in England, without a counterbalancing reduction of the national debts; and a great cause or means for this augmentation has been the annexing of the levies for repayment to the public taxes, especially the land-tax. Local improvements and benefits ought for every reason to be a burden on local resources and credit. So much less money being then needed by the State, the difference would necessarily be thrown into other investments, and municipalities would obtain what they wanted at fair market rates. On the continent of Europe such loans are commonly furnished by banks which take up a part of the stock themselves, and as agents place the rest of it in the hands of the public. The requisite funds are thus more readily found on account of the confidence felt in the prudence and financial capacity of the banks, and some hoards are drawn forth which else would have remained in barren quiescence. As civic and communal needs increase, as it may be assumed they will, in India, the supply of the necessary funds will naturally become a function of the local banks, and each zillah will thus in a considerable measure provide the capital for its own improvement.

XIV.

A taluka agrarian bank should be founded with the advantages presently to be considered, only in response to a distinctly expressed wish of the people of the taluka. Their earnestness should be proved by their subscribing at least a fair proportion of the capital. The promoters of the bank should be persons of known intelligence and respectability. With such guarantees the Government might fairly take up some of the bank's obligations at 5 per cent. in return for money, or in exchange for its own 4 per cent. stock. The local authority might further warrant a certain amount say 30 per cent. of

these obligations. Thus floated they would command a ready sale up to the amount that could prudently be issued.

No agrarian banks, however, can possibly succeed in the most indebted districts without the ground being cleared for them by a prompt and, so far as possible, an equitable adjustment of the debts of the peasantry. To effect this object, the following plan, or one resembling it, might be adopted. The experimental Act at present in force in the Deccan is so immoral in its influence that honest debtors and creditors alike shrink from all contact with it; but, so far as it operates at all, its effect must be to place capital out of reach of the cultivator, and thus condemn him to perpetual stagnation and occasional starvation.

A commission should be appointed presided over by an officer of experience, such as the talukdari settlement officer. His colleagues should be a subordinate judge and a mamlutdar of known ability. For each group of villages they should be assisted by two assessors, chosen by the Government from within the area or its neighbourhood; one to represent the agriculturists and one the capitalist class. As each group of villages was taken up, a notice should be issued calling on all persons having claims secured on lands or due by landowners therein to come forward and present them to the commissioners by a given day on pain of nullity. Care should be taken to seek out children and widows reputed to be holders of claims or charges, and all should be brought together, so that a comprehensive and correct view could be taken of the financial condition of the population within the given area.

The mass or cases sent in for adjudication should then be distributed, according to their prevailing character, in the case of each debtor, amongst the three commissioners. Each should sit singly for the disposal of as much business as possible; but there should be constant conferences on the application of the common principles to the very various instances presented by actual practice. Cases of difficulty and importance should be reserved for the three commissioners sitting together. The assessors chosen for the village or group would sit both with the single commissioner and with the collective board. The investigation should be public. The procedure should be adapted to free inquiry by the commissioners, and to a prompt and final decision. They should have full power to deal equitably with the rights of co-sharers—equitably but so as to prevent their becoming or remaining an insurmountable obstruction to improvement. In cases of unusual difficulty provision should be made for reference of questions to the High Court.

The principles of adjudication or compromise in the case of each debtor's liabilities should be but few and simple, as—

(1) Every man is bound to discharge his debts to the extent of his means beyond the sustenance of himself and his family.

(2) The State, on the ground of the general welfare of the community, is bound to enforce the fulfilment of contracts, but only to such an extent as shall not deprive the debtor of all or most of his productive usefulness as a member of the body politic.

(3) Both alike are interested in the prevention of a state of perpetual dependence of the poor on the rich, through an indefinite prolongation of the same obligations.

(4) The wishes of the parties themselves, in the circumstances, that necessitate State intervention, may properly be subordinated to the general conviction as to the steps necessary for a permanent regeneration of the economical and industrial conditions of the people.

In dealing with debts on the above principles, it would be indispensable, in many cases, to award to the creditor something less than the sum strictly due to him under the provisions of the existing law. Regard should be had to—

(1) the nature of the debt;

(2) its relation to other obligations of the debtor;

(3) the sums paid on account of it in recent years;

(4) the relation of the aggregate debts to the actual means of the debtor;

(5) the conduct of the debtor and the creditor in their mutual transactions.

In some instances there would be debts of various kinds, on high and low considerations, due to various persons. Some creditors, it might be found, had been unduly favoured by the debtor: others might have helped themselves unduly out of his estate, with a harmful result to their competitors. For all such facts due allowance should be made by the commission, and a ratio of equitable right should be established amongst the claims, so that where one might be set down at 90 per cent. of its amount in forming the aggregate to be satisfied, if possible, another might perhaps be entered at only 60 or 50 per cent. of its nominal amount.

In providing for payment of the debts thus proportionately admitted, it would, in many cases, happen that the estate of the debtor was obviously insufficient. Under such circumstances, where the debtor had been guilty of gross fraud, his property should be sold without reserve. He would have shown himself unworthy of the position designed for him only as an honest, struggling worker, with a disposition and capacity to do well were the opportunity afforded to him. In other cases of deficiency the agricultural debtor's holding might obviously be too large for his means. In such a case the excess should be sold, as a source of positive impoverishment to the present owner. Where there was not such an excess, but a holding capable of profitable culture and of sustaining a moderate burden in addition to the land-tax, this burden should be considered an asset available for creditors. The personal property of the debtor saleable

in execution of decrees should be deemed an additional asset ; but instead of being wasted by a forced sale it should be entered at its appraised value in the computation of the debtor's paying capacity. His land, as an asset, should be reckoned at about seven years' purchase of the fair market rent over and above the land-tax. It is demonstrable that with interest ranging at the mofussil rates of from 9 to 24 per cent., land could not bear a greater charge than about seven years' rent, because any excess would equal or exceed the whole purchase-money. The assets being thus ascertained would be compared with the aggregate liabilities ; the percentage of possible satisfaction would be ascertained ; and the shares of the several creditors *inter-se* would be determined according to the relative proportions already determined.

At this stage the recognized liabilities and assets would stand in clear apposition. But how to convert the assets? and how to pay the creditors severally the sums coming to them ? Here the taluka bank would come in to perform its necessary function. According to the amount of his established claim each creditor would, at his option, either be registered as a sharer in the bank for an equal amount, or else he would be handed debentures of the bank of a like amount, bearing interest at 5 per cent., or alternatively Government 4 per cent. paper of equal value according to any market rate not below par. The taluka bank or the district bank would willingly convert the debentures, were it desired, into equivalent annuities, perpetual or terminable.

The debtor would be debited with the aggregate amount of the debts thus discharged for him by the taluka bank, and would be required to pay off the principal and interest at 8 per cent. by annual instalments extending over a series of years. Thus 15 per cent. annually on the amount advanced would extinguish the debt in ten years ; 10 per cent. would extinguish it in twenty-one years ; and 9 per cent. in thirty years. Without paying so much as the usual rate of interest alone, the debtor would find himself freed from both principal and interest within a time that he could quite appreciate. The difference of 3 per cent. would cover risk and pay profit to the bank. The creditor, dissatisfied with 5 per cent., could sell his debentures and use the proceeds as he pleased. The bank should be bound to redeem by drawing a due proportion of its debentures every year.

In giving effect to this plan, the Government would be called on to give to the bank the same aid that has been accorded to similar institutions in Europe. It should collect the redemption instalments as an item of land revenue in the case of landholders' debts, and account to the bank after each collection for the proceeds. Its own expenses would thus hardly be perceptibly increased, and the bank would be made safe. Yet this assistance might properly be limited

to the recovery of the advances made at the initiation of the scheme leaving future transactions to be conducted in the ordinary way. A similar reason would justify similar help by Government during a term of years in recovering advances made for the purchase of agricultural stock, and for giving increased fertility to the land.

The land, subject to changes in favour of the taluka bank, should be made incapable of any further hypothecation during the subsistence of the charge—until, that is, all the prescribed instalments had been paid—except with the sanction of the bank.

Partition of the land charged should not affect the liability of each and every part of it, except when made with the assent of the bank and a fair distribution of the liability.

It would be worth considering whether any mortgage of lands at all should be allowed within the taluka, except to its bank, during a term of twenty years or so. The taluka bank should in return be compelled to employ a moiety of its profits beyond 8 per cent. in reducing the rate of interest charged for its advances. The circumstances which warrant the State's intervening at all, warrant its intervening effectually for the purpose in view, and in twenty years it is to be expected that the borrowing class will have learned to appreciate the advantages offered by the bank and have become indisposed to renew their slavery to the sowkar. In any case it might be made a permanent requisite of a good hypothecation that it should be promptly notified to the taluka bank. Safety to the latter would be economy to the borrower of every class.

As the land pledged to the taluka bank for the satisfaction of creditors would for the most part be thus burdened as heavily as was compatible with the holders' prosperity, the Government should engage not to raise the land-tax on any such estate during the subsistence of the obligation. An intermediately revised assessment should take effect only on the extinction of the mortgage. The necessity of this is obvious ; and the advantage would be great if the Government would in all cases, and as an element of its general policy, engage never at any one revision of the assessment to augment the land tax by more than 50 per cent., or beyond 20 per cent. of a fair ground rent where improvements had made this proportion exceed the previous land-tax. On the regulation of loans and the other details of management of the district and taluka banks much might be said, but not perhaps much that would be very useful at the present time. Should these institutions be established on principles such as have here been suggested, valuable instruction for conducting their operations can be drawn from the writings of Schulze in Germany and of Luzzati, Levi, and others in Italy ; still more, perhaps, from the reports and statutes of the institutions themselves in those countries, and in France and Belgium. Under such arrangements as have been proposed the sowkars of a taluka would

find it to their interest to become sharers in the local bank rather than carry on a competing business, and every encouragement should be held out to this transfer. The sowkars enlisted on the side of a popular bank could render it most valuable services, and in the beginning some sacrifices might well be made to secure their co-operation. Care would at the same time have to be taken that, with their experience and astutenes, they did not get the management into their own hands, or make use of the bank as an instrument for their own purposes. The machinery for prompt compulsion in the case of dilatory debtors and the safeguards against abuse of it could be devised on existing models by the well manned legislative department of the Government of India.

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM,

BEING

TWO LETTERS

ON

CERTAIN ASPECTS

OF

The Indian National Congress

MOVEMENT.

Printed by the Calcutta Central Press Co., Ld.

NAINI TAL,
October 8th, 1888.

MY DEAR HUME,

I PROMISED to you in my letter of September 25th that as soon as the tour I was then making was over I would reply to yours of the 19th idem. I lose no time in fulfilling that promise.

2. I have to thank you very much for the kindly spirit in which your letter is written, and for the information which you give me with regard to the statements in respect of my attitude towards the Congress party, which have reached your ears. You write: "To put the matter as succinctly as possible, "the essential points of these misrepresentations are that "you are personally hostile to the Congress—that you desire "to ruin all who take a prominent part in it—that you will "favour and reward all who oppose it, and that no man has "a chance of promotion or recommendation for honours from "you who is not willing to spend money in opposing it and "who does not publicly and privately denounce it."

3. "Now, monstrous as this may seem, not only is it "believed, but I can hardly find it in my heart to ridicule "and scold (as I do) those who accept such absurd falsehoods; "because, I am sorry to say, that these have been promulgated "not only by men like Sir Syed Ahmed—who told all his "friends that one of his ridiculously violent speeches had been "made at your suggestion—but also by responsible European "officials, who really cannot, it seems to me, have believed all "they told people."

4. After indicating what you consider my views on the subject possibly to be, you add: "Now if this be really, as "I believe, your position, will you say so? Will you say so in "some speech? Will you say so in a letter to me, which I may "publish, or of which, if I may not publish it, I may use the "purport, and which I may show privately to all infidels? "Or will you take some other means of making these points "clear?"

5. Before entering further upon the subject, I must, in justice to an old friend, say that it is not I only who have been misrepresented. I have known Sir Syed Ahmed for the last thirty years; and have found him, as I believe all who know him have always found him, a man of the most scrupulous

truthfulness. I have not a shadow of hesitation in saying that it is as absolutely impossible that Sir Syed Ahmed should have made any such statement as has been attributed to him by your informants as that I should have taken up the irreconcileable rôle which in the same quarter has been assigned to me. What I have to say in this letter is identical in substance with what I have said in conversation with all those to whom I may have spoken on the subject. It will enable you to judge how far the responsible European officials of whom you speak have my authority for the views which you tell me they ascribe to me.

6. If I am compelled in some considerable measure, in the course of what I have to say, to differ from you, or to criticise from a point of view which may seem to you disappointing, the action of the Congress party, I hope to do so in the spirit of moderation and reasonableness in which you have written to me. It is inevitable that this movement, which invites the attention both of those who are concerned with the Government and of the public at large, should be seriously weighed and examined by all who are resident in India, and especially by those who are responsible for the administration of its several Provinces. It is to be expected by critics of the Government that they should in turn be criticised. It is equally inevitable that the conclusions arrived at by those who approach the subject from different points of view should in many respects differ; and all that I need ask, you will, I am sure, gladly concede, *viz.*, that credit should be given me, when I differ from you, for the same measure of good faith and good will which you would claim and receive at my hands.

7. "If then there be anything objectionable in the move-"ment it must be either in its methods or its measures." You will remember these words in your speech at Allahabad, on the 30th April last, and anything that I now have to say may conveniently follow upon those lines.

8. I may at once concede that, until very recently, in fact until the issue of the Report of the Third "Indian National Congress" held at Madras, I saw little to object to, whether in method or in measure. It was possibly questionable whether in the present embryo state of political life in India, agitation such as was encouraged by the operations of the Congress was not likely to cause some miscarriage of the ends desired. The experiment is quite new in India, and the circumstances which surround it are not wholly favourable to its development. Events have shown, too, that those who anticipated

that agitation would produce agitation, and that we should shortly see the country divided into two or more strongly hostile camps, were correct in their surmise. It remains yet to be seen whether, in a country of which the Government is carried on in the conditions imposed upon us in India, it is possible to permit contending parties the same freedom of political action and uncontrolled liberty of organization which in England has, after long centuries and in very different conditions, been but comparatively of late years acquired. But, however this may be, I, at least, saw nothing worthy of grave objection in the method adopted during the first two Congresses; much, on the contrary, that was interesting and new to me. The measures aimed at seemed to me, indeed, not such as would commend themselves much to the people of that part of India with which I am best acquainted; but any objections I personally may have felt toward them were objections of degree rather than of kind. I thought that the people of these Provinces cared little about the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State, and absolutely nothing about Volunteering. But if, on the other hand, it seemed to me that the claim for any considerable system of representation would not be understood or supported by any considerable section here, or suitable to their present state of political development, I was entirely at one with the Congress party in desiring extension on some broader basis than at present obtains of the Legislative Councils—a measure, for the rest, which had been before the minds of high authorities in this country before the Congress party had been heard of, and is independent of their initiative.

9. With the issue of the Report of the Madras Meeting, I must admit, with the greatest regret, that the sympathy with which I had hitherto looked upon the party received a severe check. In the speech to which I have above referred you say: "But what have been its methods? Firstly, quiet "teachings and preachings throughout the greater part of the "country of simple elementary political truths. The people "are taught to recognise the many benefits that they owe to "British rule, as also the fact that on the peaceful continuance "of that rule depend all hopes for the peace and prosperity "of the country. They are taught that the many hardships "and disabilities of which they complain are, after all, though "real enough, small in comparison with the blessings they "enjoy. * * * These teachings have gone on so quietly and "unostentatiously that they have never once attracted even "serious attention, much less unfavourable comment. Second, "amongst our methods is the distribution of elementary tracts

"setting forth similar doctrines and embodying teachings con-
"ceived in a like spirit in regard to the rights and duties of
"subjects. Of two of these, *viz.*, Mr. Veraraghava Chariar's
"Congress Catechism and a Conversation between Moulvi
"Furiduddeen and one Rambuksh of Kambakhtpur, some
"50,000 copies were circulated during the past year, and perhaps
"half a million will be so circulated during the present year;
"and so far as I know these are the only tracts yet sent out.
"Although they are to be met with in every one of the twelve
"languages of India they are also published in English, and
"every one of you may judge them for himself. I submit that,
"when read as they stand, there is not one of you who will
"not agree that they are loyal and kindly alike in spirit and
"in word."

10. I wish I could agree with you that in the teachings and preachings and elementary tracts, or in those, at least, with which I have become acquainted, the people are taught to recognize the many benefits they owe to British rule, or the fact that on the peaceful continuance of that rule depend all hopes for the peace and prosperity of the country; or that the pamphlets to which you refer are kindly and loyal alike in spirit and in word. I have read carefully and repeatedly through both of them; and while I find frequent passages, such as those which I will presently quote, holding up the British Government and the English officials in India, to the indignation of the people as unjust, inconsiderate, ill-informed, and reckless of the consequences of their actions, I have failed to find in them a single passage in which the advantages conferred upon India by that rule have been so much as referred to. Here and there some of the officers of the Government in India are given credit, if not for good service rendered, at least for good intentions. But anything that may be said upon this score is far more than obscured by the thickness and depth of the darker shades of the picture. Of the India of to-day, as we know it; of India under education; of India compelled, in the interests of the weaker masses, to submit to impartial justice; of India brought together by road and rail; of India entering into the first-class commercial markets of the world; of India of religious toleration; of India, assured for terms of years unknown in less fortunate Europe, of profound and unbroken peace; of India of the free Press; of India, finally, taught for the first time that the end and aim of rule is the welfare of the people and not the personal aggrandisement of the Sovereign,—I fail to find a syllable of recognition. These are the pamphlets which, as we are told in the Preface to the last Congress Report, are circulated in thousands about

the country, and for the substance of these pamphlets the critics of the Congress necessarily hold the leaders of that party responsible. I will quote some of the passages which illustrate the strictures which I have been compelled to make, and which I regard as at one and the same time grievously misrepresenting the British administration in India, and teaching the people to ascribe to it sufferings and wrongs which are nowhere defined or even indicated, but which are over and over again insisted on, without precautions taken, such as candour and prudence dictate, lest ignorant and illiterate men—in other words, lest the great majority of those to whom they purport to be addressed—should be tempted to impute to that administration all that, however hard and disagreeable, is necessary and inevitable in the circumstances which burden their lives. I will quote first from the Tamil Catechism: "The disabilities under which we "(the people of India) labour are never fully realized by them "(the English Parliament). If our many grievances could "only be made clear to their view in their true colours, you "may rest assured that they would be gradually redressed. "The English nation, as a body, has no conception of all the "hardships and disadvantages under which we labour under "the existing administration here. Nor do the English "officials in India ever report to the Members of Parliament "what we know to be the true state of this country. * * * "They necessarily believe that all they do is right, and that it "is done in the best possible manner; and, lastly, they not un-"naturally do not desire either a reduction of their salaries "or their powers, and this would certainly follow if the "English public came really to understand how matters at "this present time really stand." Again: "It is only by per-"sisting in the agitation that we can make our grievance heard "in England. If the English nation begin to evince interest in "the affairs of this country, the opposition of the Anglo-Indian "officials, who wish to keep matters as they are, will soon "cease to be effective. * * * * The Government offer "some native gentlemen seats in the Council, merely, it would "seem, to lead the people of England into the belief that in "the Government of this country Native opinion receives due "weight." Again: "Then, too, Government mostly chooses, "not people who will fight for our rights, but more or less fool-"ish big men, who will do just what they are told by Govern-"ment. So it follows that very few of the natives who have "hitherto sat in Council have tried to do good for us. * * * * "So you see, even if our people tried, which only a few ever "have done, to fight our battles, they could do nothing, for

" these Councils are a mere sham." Again : " Progress and " reform are equally impossible. * * * * * The Members who " owe their seats in Council to the good-will of the Government " will naturally, as a rule, vote in their favour. And they " dare not fight for the people's cause on pain of never being " reappointed."

11. To me who witnessed in 1885 the debates over the Bengal Rent Act, in the Viceroy's Legislative Council, and assisted in 1886 in the passing of the Oudh Rent Act, by which the rights of the cultivators in Oudh were affirmed and maintained by the Government ; who witnessed the strenuous opposition of the Bengal Zamindars, and the Oudh Talukdars, ably led and strictly conducted by their representatives in the Legislative Council ; and who had occasion, I may add, at the same time to admire the capacity and thorough sifting of the subject which characterized their proceedings in Select Committee, the assertion in these paras., that the Legislative Council is a sham ; that progress and reform are equally impossible; that the Government will not choose members who fight for what they believe to be their rights ; that the native members of the Council never oppose the Government ; that the measures of the Government are opposed to the rights of the people,—is amazing. It was on behalf of the rights of the very class, the ryots, to whom these pamphlets are addressed, that the Government, in strong opposition to the native members of its Legislative Council, was in both instances contending. It would have seemed incredible to me that within a few months of the opposition and public excitement which these measures aroused, any one could have penned the passage to which I call attention. They may pass muster in England, because, as is said, truly enough, in the same pamphlet : " The English nation do not " at all understand the real state of affairs here. * * * " Everything, in short, is so different that to understand matters " here an Englishman, who has never lived in India, must " *make* a regular study of the subject." To us, however, whose business in life it is to make a regular study of the subject, it must be matter of the deepest regret that those who are equally well informed with ourselves should, in the course of their endeavours to remodel the scheme of administration in India, put forward illustrations such as these. My own experience of the native members of the Legislative Council is that, while they are apathetic so long as questions are under discussion in which they feel no immediate concern, so soon as they think their interests are at stake, they stand to their guns like men. What their attitude would be if, in some

great political question, they found themselves in opposition to the Government, neither you nor I can say. But it is only just to them to assume that if they attached importance to such a question they would act in conformity with our past experience of them.

12. I pass now to the second pamphlet. Distinction is there drawn between the happy state of the villagers of Shamshpur and those of Rajah Harbansrai. "He (Rajah "Harbansrai) lives away in the *Sudder*, and he never comes "near us, and he never reads any of our petitions, and never "consults any of us; indeed he won't see us, but sends out an "order for us to speak to the *Naib* (his Deputy, or Head "Manager, or Agent), or the *Gomashtah* (Factor), who lives "in the Rajah's house here, and as for the Gomashtah he "never knows anything about us or the village, for one comes "for six months and then goes, and the other comes for a couple "of years and then he goes, and then another comes and so "on. And except dear old Rai Sacharam, there has never been "a Naib or Gomashtah here who did not think he knew more "about everything than any of us, or all of us put together. "They are all alike, these Gomashtahs. *Jau! Chupraho* (Go "away! Hold your tongue); don't do this; don't do that; "pay this; pay that!"

"*Moulvi Fariduddin.*—Well, when a Government behaves "as Rajah Harbansrai does, we call it a '*Despotic*' Govern- "ment. But how does your village thrive?"

"*Rambaksh.*—How does it thrive? Why, *Moulvi Saheb*, "you know that there is never a day but that there is some "case from Kambakhtpur in Court, that we are growing "poorer and poorer, that land is going out of cultivation, that "we have scarcely oxen enough to plough what we still till. "Look down the street, why the houses are, half of them, "nearly in ruins, and the two *abkari* (liquor) shops that the "*Sirkar* has set up here are always full. Even this chopal, "built by our forefathers and so much needed for our "meetings and our guests, is now in ruins. Look at "Shamshpur. It is twice as populous as this village, and "yet there is no abkari shop there, and the Lumberdar "(senior proprietor) says there never shall be, and so say "they all. Thrive indeed! Of all the miserable places in "this whole district, Kambakhtpur is nearly one of the "worst."

"*Moulvi Fariduddin.*—I am afraid that is too true. But "why is this? Rajah Harbansrai is not a bad man. I live "in the *Sudder* and see much of him. He is rather a kind,

"good man, though so occupied with his great big house "there, and his troops of servants, that he has no time to "look after his affairs in the Mofussil."

"*Rambaksh.*—That's just it. I don't say he *is* a "bad man, but we never see him. We send him peti- "tions, but he takes no notice of them. So far as any "good to us is concerned he might be dead; but, for all "that, he must have his money, and almost every year, "more money and more money, till we poor people are al- "most skin and bone. Ah! If we were only cattle, as the "*Saheb* said, we might perhaps make a rupee or two out of "our skins; it is about all we have left." The Rajah Harbansrai is obviously the Government of India, and the Provincial Governors are, I suppose, his Naibs; while under and because of their rule ignorant people are invited by this pamphlet to believe that they are growing poorer and poorer, that land is going out of cultivation, that they have scarcely oxen enough to plough what they still till, that the houses are half of them nearly in ruins, that the liquor shops are always full, that of all the miserable places in the world India is nearly one of the worst, and that the skins of its inhabitants is about all that they have left. The pamphlet proceeds:

"*Moulvi Fariduddin.*—Ah! Rambaksh, the *Chota Saheb* "may think you cattle, but you are wiser than he was. "For this evil *dustur*, which is ruining you and your "neighbours and village, is the 'DESPOTIC' (*Khud Muktiar*) "*dustur*. And when rulers govern their subjects in this "same way, we call theirs a 'DESPOTIC' Government, and "'DESPOTIC' Governments always ruin the countries in which "they are carried on for long. They may be necessary in the "infancy of a nation; they become crimes when it grows up. "Now you have a practical knowledge of both systems; you "see how Shamshpur is prospering under a 'CONSTITUTIONAL' "system, and you know only too thoroughly what Kambakhtpur "is coming to under the 'DESPOTIC' system, and pray have "you any doubts as to which of these two is best? * * * * *

"*Rambaksh* (after some consideration).—Well, there is our "good Queen-Empress; she never comes here, certainly, and "we never see her, and I hear the people in Hakikatabad sent "her a petition last year, and they do say nearly a lakh of "people signed it, but she never took any notice of it. But "they say she is so busy there over in *Vallayat* (England) "and has so many countries elsewhere belonging to her that "she has no time to attend to us Indians. When I come to "think of it, may God long preserve her, but I don't know

"that it does signify much *to us who* sits upon the *gaddi* "(throne) over there in Vallayat. I must say that this is all "rather like Rajah Harbansrai's *dustur*. Certainly, I never "heard that she consulted any of us Indians on any point, and "so as to *gaonkhurch* (village expenses)—well, I have heard in "Hakikatabad what krors and krors of money are every year "spent by the *Saheb log* (Europeans) and without consulting "any one! No! This is not at all like the Shamshpur *dustur*."

"*Moulvi Fariduddin.*—And then look at all the *Naibs* and "*Gomashtas* she sends. Are they not like Rajah Harbansrai's? "Very respectable men, no doubt; they don't take bribes; they "don't certainly try to injure us, but what do they know of "us and our real wants? Don't they pooh-pooh our old customs, "and *har ke amad* (each who comes) insist on introducing "some new-fangled device for improving the condition of "the country which not unfrequently ends in doing it harm? "Do they consult us? Do they ever *really* talk over *anything* "with us? Do they take care to see that we approve, and "agree to everything, nay to *anything* they see fit to do? "Is it not with them as with your Kambakhtpur Naibs? "'What do you know you cattle folk? Hold your tongues! "Do this! Don't do this!' Is this like the 'CONSTITUTIONAL' "management of Shamshpur or like the 'DESPOTIC' of Kam- "bakhtpur?"

"*Rambaksh.*—Ah! *Moulvi Sahib*, you are a learned man, but "I see now what you mean, and I suppose our Government "is what you call a 'DESPOTIC' one, and that perhaps is why "the whole country now is discontented (it never was so when "I was a boy), and why everything seems, from all I hear, "to be going wrong, and why the Government *jumma* is always "being raised, and with it our rents, and new taxes are "imposed and * * *

"*Moulvi Fariduddin.*—Yes, certainly, our Government is "a 'DESPOTIC' one, and a 'DESPOTIC' Government is always, "when long continued, bad for every country, and we in "our country are suffering in a hundred ways on this very "account. But don't think I am speaking evil of our *Governors*, "for I know many of them personally, and know that, as a "rule, they are good and well-meaning men—men, in many mat- "ters, far more highly educated than the best of us. It is not the "officers, it is not the members of Government, or the Lieu- "tenant-Govenors or Viceroys, that I find fault with. I hate "the foolish fault-finding spirit, in which some of our news- "papers abuse, and wrongly attribute bad motives to many "of those whom I *know* to be good men. What I condemn

"and protest against is the system: it is against the system "(*dustur*) of the Government, not against the gentlemen "who carry on the Government (and who are as much tied "down by that system as ourselves) that I complain."

13. The Government of India is here described as a Despotic Government, which, except by a misuse of the term as usually employed, it is not. It is contended that, after a certain period of their existence, all Despotic Governments are pernicious. It is assumed that this period has arrived in India; and the present Government of India is thereupon charged with the existence of misrule and of public suffering which can only be remedied by the gradual and progressive introduction of representative Government. On the above four assumptions rests the final conclusion. With regard to all four the onus of proof rests with the Congress party; and until some serious effort has been made to dispose of it, I think you must expect to find a considerable section of the community, both here and elsewhere, will hesitate to accept the conclusion.

14. I find, for the rest in the above paras., plenty of teaching as to the hardships and disabilities of which the people are to complain. I fail, however, to find any definite, or even indefinite, statement of the nature of those hardships or disabilities, beyond the assertion (of which they can appreciate the value) that nothing is left to them but their skins. I entirely fail to recognise in the picture of the material ruin of Kambakhtpur (the Luckless Village) anything in any way approaching to the British India of to-day, such as I know it. I fail equally to find a single paragraph that is kindly, whether in spirit or in word, in this terrible and unrelieved picture of a starving, oppressed, and brutalised India groaning under an unsympathetic and oppressive rule, and robbed by men who, in the words of the pamphlet, if not "quite so bad as "Mr. Zubburdust, nevertheless exist in great numbers abusing "their official powers, and guilty of most unjustifiable acts of "high-handedness." Abuse of official powers and acts of high-handedness have not been unknown to India in past times and under former dynasties, and many many years must pass, probably, before they will wholly cease to exist. But I venture to remind you that, such as they are, they are the exception and not the rule among our English officials; and that to base upon exceptional cases an accusation against the order at present existing, with a view to its subversion by general acclamation, is not consistent with a quiet teaching and preaching of simple elementary political truths; as, on the other hand, to force upon the people these hideous caricatures of British rule in India, is in violent contradiction to the statement that "the people

"are taught that the many hardships and disabilities of which "they complain are, after all, though real enough, small in "comparison with the blessings they enjoy." How can they be so taught, consistently with the theme to be proved, *viz.*, the calamity of Despotic Government? You will have seen in the newspapers that these pamphlets have incurred the severest censures from a variety of native pens. It is easy to say, as the *National Congress* newspapers habitually contend, that these pens are hired or are self-seeking. I, for my part, feeling, so strongly as I do, the extreme unwisdom and unfairness of writing and circulating among ignorant and excitable people, foreign to us in blood, and differing in religion, such accusations as these, against the present Government in India, am unable to agree that native gentlemen who profess to share the same view are necessarily actuated by feelings other than my own. I can quite understand a man saying to himself: "This is, minching Mallecho; this means mischief." I think it was in an evil hour for the interests of the Congress party that those pamphlets were penned or published. Space forbids me to deal with them at greater length, but I should like to indicate them to you in a spirit of the most friendly remonstrance, as bearing, in my eyes, a character which is absolutely inconsistent with what, judging from the remarks in your speech of April, they seem to carry to you. In that "good will to all" which you desire to adopt as your watchword, they even appear to me to be conspicuously wanting.

15. Another of the methods of the Congress which seems to me open to serious objection is that of identifying itself with the majority of the people of India, and of habitually assuming that it has the right to speak in the name of that majority. In your introduction to the Madras Report you have been careful to point out that the Congress is as yet far from representing the people, or "by any means so broad-"based upon the people's will as has been supposed and assert-"ed." Indeed, the only possible ground on which any claim for general representation could be put forward consistently with what you have said in your preface, is that, "if the mat-"ter was carefully explained to them, 90 per cent. of the adult "male members of the entire community would ratify and "express concurrence in the conclusions of the Congress." That is as it may be. There is much virtue in your "if." But I am unable to reconcile this statement with the appeal put forward by Dadabhai Naoroji, who is, I believe, the accredited "repre-"sentative in Great Britain of the National Indian Congress," purporting to come from "200,000,000 British subjects

"India, to the British people." You admit in your preface that "we cannot, making all allowances, see grounds for sup- "posing that more than 10 per cent. of these (a population of "nearly 200,000,000) at the utmost, even indirectly and pas- "sively supported the Congress." I do not know what is meant by indirect and passive support. But I would ask you to consider whether, in the face of an admission such as this, your representative in London should have been allowed to publish, *urbi et orbi*, an appeal in the character of the representative of the whole population of India. As a minor illustration of this same objection I may perhaps be allowed, in passing, to refer to the passage in your preface in which you speak of the "pretended defection of the Musulman community from this "national movement." It does not seem to me, even in view of the facts that were known to the public at that time, that the use of the word "pretended" is justifiable.

16. Of the unmeasured and often scurrilous language of some of the Congress newspapers I will say nothing, for I see that you yourself in your speech at Allahabad deprecate it. I can only regret that they may be tempted to appeal for countenance to passages such as those which I have extracted from the pamphlets authorised by the Congress. Style is, of course, matter of opinion; and if you had not in your speech of April expressed disapproval of railing accusations, and asked the supporters of the Congress to "deal in all charity with "their opponents," I should not have ventured to call your attention to the paragraph in your own preface, in which you write—"we can only conclude of any who persist in denouncing "our political Congress, because it is not also a Social Con- "ference, that Divine Providence, in its inscrutable wisdom, "has seen fit to withhold from them either integrity, or intel- "lect, or *both*." (The italics are not mine.) To say of a man who differs from you that he must either, in plain English, be a knave or a fool, or both, is not, I may perhaps venture, in your own words, to remind you, to "deal with him in all "charity," or to afford yourself ground for hoping that you will "sooner or later enjoy the permissible, nay blessed, "revenge of returning good for evil." That those whom you have so vigorously criticised have some not insufficient ground for the error into which you pursue them, is evident to me from a perusal of the three fundamental objects of the movement as stated in pages 2 and 3 of your speech, *viz.*, "First: the fusion into one National whole of all the different "and, till recently, discordant elements that constitute the "population of India. Second, the gradual regeneration along "all lines, mental, moral, social and political, of the nation

"thus evolved ; and, third, the consolidation of the union "between England and India, by securing the modification of "such of its conditions as may be unjust or injurious to the "latter country." The gradual regeneration along the social line is there stated to be one of the objects of what is called the national movement. A few lines afterwards I read that, "people are found fatuous enough to urge it as a reproach that "the Congress does not directly meddle with social questions. "Why the man who should insist on using—let us say a "plough—as a vehicle in which to drive along a *pucca* road "instead of confining it to its proper use of ploughing the fields, "would not be a greater fool than the man who should en- "deavour to work out the delicate and intricate questions of "social reform by the aid of the rough-and-ready engine of "the National Political Congress." What, I think, people have objected to is not so much that the Congress does not deal with social questions as that, with social questions so urgently requiring to be dealt with, a body, having for its main object political changes, should have thrust itself across the path of reform. What, if I understand them rightly, your critics say is, not that they expect the Congress team to draw the ponderous car of social reform, but that they find you putting your political *char-a-banc* before their social reform horse, with the result that neither will you progress nor can they make a single stride. They fear that the people of India will find it infinitely more agreeable to clamour for place and power, to cry aloud to all that pass by, that they are, in spite of much testimony to the contrary, aggrieved and neglected, to scramble for the loaves and to dive for the fishes, than to impose upon themselves the rigorous discipline of social re- form, and to abandon time-honoured but harmful practices. They ask of them only that they should listen to those who appeal to the physician to commence by healing himself.

17. You have compared in your remarks at Allahabad the Congress party with the infant Hercules. Let us be consistent in our comparisons, and remember, in this connection, that the prodigies of the infant were confined to the limits of his domestic circle, and directed to the extirpation of the poisonous and life-crushing reptiles which infested it, and which threatened to strangle him; the cleansing of the Augean stables (and, I may add, the pursuit of the golden fruit) being reserved for maturer years.

18. So much for the methods of which you spoke in April last. I hope that I have dealt fairly with them, and explained, in all moderation and good will, the reasons for which they have caused me, to my deep regret, to disapprove

of the action of your party. If I may be allowed to refer to my own opinions, I may venture to say that I also am in the Liberal Official Camp. But this does not oblige me to agree with all the methods of attack or to approve of all the implements of warfare employed by volunteer auxiliaries.

19. With regard to measures, as I have already said, I believe that the desire to extend the Indian element in the Councils was antecedent to, and entirely independent of, any action of the Congress party. Judging from your Resolutions and from what I read in your last report, it seems to me probable that you would propose to go further than I, were I at present a member of the Government of India, should be disposed to follow you. But I find it difficult precisely to ascertain what is the scheme which the Congress party would wish to see adopted. In the Tamil Catechism, for instance, I read: "Our countrymen should do their best to establish in "India a representative Council similar to the Parliament of "Great Britain to consider the questions that relate to our "well-being. We should get the permission of the British "Parliament to elect the members of that Council. Her "Majesty the Queen-Empress should make the resolutions of "that Council binding upon the Governors-General and "Governors." A representative Council, the resolutions of which are binding on the Governor-General and Governors, is in effect a ruling body. Elsewhere, however, when addressing, not the villager but a more informed audience, I find the proposals less ambitious. "The absurd nonsense that has "been written and talked about this matter is almost in-"credible. We have been gravely assured that the Congress "people want to get the Government into their hands." I quote from your Allahabad speech, and must be permitted to add that, if absurd nonsense has been talked, it has at least Catechism and text to appeal to. A really representative Council, in the present state of India, would include, you will have foreseen, very few of the class who crowd the Congress benches. In so far as men of that kind might succeed by energy or by manipulation of the necessary methods, in entering the Council as representative of the majority, they would occupy a false position. All that they could claim usually to represent (and the Government in settling this question must look as, *pace* the pamphlets, it always does look, to what will contribute most to the good government of India) is the small section of men educated under our system—the pleaders, the lawyers, the newspaper editors, the classes who, in their own shewing, furnished more than two-fifths of the Madras meeting, and who form the

fragment of the Indian people which owes its existence to British workmanship. They can, at the most, claim to represent their own views ; and if representation be adjusted to numbers, numerically they will be nowhere. Their business at present seems to me to be to seek to communicate to their countrymen the enlightenment which they themselves have received, more than to attempt to represent in the Councils of the State either themselves or those to whom enlightenment has not hitherto been vouchsafed. I think in a word they would, if I might dare to advise them, be more usefully employed in educating the people than in educating the authorities. I would cordially extend to them that measure of recognition which (when deprived of the magnifying medium in which, as I think, they have unwisely enveloped themselves) their education, their loyalty, and whatever is valuable in their views may require ; but certainly I would not upset the whole economy of Indian administration with its hitherto peaceful progress, and its many mansions, in order to accommodate them under its roof. It seems to me unreasonable to ask that a large system of representation should be introduced at the demand of an extremely small and peculiar section of the people ; or that the existence of a class which has been created by the Government should be cited as sufficient reason for modifying, to a very serious degree, methods of administration familiar, and on the whole agreeable, to those vast masses of the people who live in the traditions of the Government of their forefathers, whose ideas of polity find their roots far back in centuries long gone by, and who are as much out of harmony with the political atmosphere breathed by us of English birth, or desired by their own countrymen of English education, as an elephant would be out of his element in Scotch mists, or a banyan tree in Parliament Street. The Government of the English in India is the Government of a people far more advanced than those among whom it exists, and it approaches public matters from points of view which in great measure Indians are at present, and for long years must be, incapable of adopting. It is for the Congress to show how such a Government can, without sacrificing nearly all that makes its presence useful, consent to subordinate its policy to the popular verdict. These people are *in statu pupillari ;* can they profitably be invited to govern their guardian ?

20. Judging from the Resolutions of the last and previous Congresses, the grievances and wrongs of the people are far other than those which the language of the pamphlets, and

indeed of your speech of April last, would have led me to suppose. The aims of the Congress are frequently spoken of in Congress literature as "THE CAUSE." Putting aside the extension of Legislative Councils, which is by no means peculiarly the child of the Congress, I find in the record of the Madras meeting the Resolutions which embody the latest exposition of the "THE CAUSE." It is to these Resolutions naturally that one turns to find some setting forth of the grievances and wrongs which are the jewels in the Congress Crown. If a representative Council is to be established to abolish the Arms Act, replacing, by Legislation, in the hands of the people weapons of which the unrestricted use under former dynasties has grievously mutilated the roll of Indian annals, and in our own time traced the bitterest and most bloody chapter in our Anglo-Indian History, I cannot but think that it would be far less usefully employed, so far as the people are concerned, than those unreformed Legislatures which have passed the Revenue and Rent Acts, for example, for all the provinces of Upper India, which have worked out the Indian Penal and Procedure Codes, which have passed a variety of measures for the convenience of the mercantile community, which have created Municipalities, crushed Infanticide, and which, in a thousand measures, have turned the attention of the people to arts of peace, with a view to lead them to abandon their old predatory habits. The separation of the Executive and Judicial is a question of administration, which is by no means easy of initiation, or sure to succeed; foreign as it is to the notions and contrary to the customs of all Eastern countries, who aim at centralizing, not at dispersing authority. It is, moreover, largely a question of ways and means. The claim to be enrolled as volunteers, put forward as a "national" claim, is just a little strained, is it not? If the Resolutions on these four points are the head and substance of "THE CAUSE" in its latest phases, I must honestly be permitted to say that I see nothing in "THE CAUSE" whatever, for which a Rajput or a Brahman of Upper India would sacrifice a hair of his whiskers.

21. To sum up this matter of measures: you will gather from what I have said that the claim of the Congress party to have introduced a new order of ideas into India seems to me not to rest upon facts. They have seized upon an idea already familiar to the Government, as witness Lord Dufferin's Jubilee speech; and they have pushed it, as it seems to me, to extremes which cannot be defended, more especially in view of the circumstance that the party purports to speak on behalf of millions whom it had no opportunity of consulting, and who have given it no warrant whatsoever.

The catalogue of claims which constitute its "CAUSE" appear to me to be very far from embodying any considerable popular feeling. They represent the wishes of a class, and that a minute and exceptional class. Shorn of fictitious and exaggerated pretensions, I think the movement offers little to unfavourable criticism. It seems to me, however, probable that the attacks which it has invited by overspreading its natural borders, will discredit much which otherwise might have been useful; and that the aggressive tone which its organs adopt may rather hinder than assist the Government, when the hour for action may seem to it to have come.

22. I have expressed myself in this letter as I think you would wish me to do, with the perfect freedom which your letter invited, and also, I trust, with the perfect fairness which the tone of your letter requires of me. I look to your indulgence not to class me with those who have fallen victims to the "inscrutable wisdom of Providence." My opinions, such as they are, have been formed after patient examination and experience of the subjects with which I have dealt in this letter, and it is with a sense of deep disappointment only that I have come to the conclusion that the answer to the question put by you, as to whether there is anything objectionable in the methods or the measures of the movement, is that, in my judgment, there is much. I have endeavoured to show what seems to me to be objectionable, whether in the one or the other regard. I think it objectionable in the highest degree that, in order to introduce changes in the administration of the Government in India, the Indian Government and its officials should be held up to the hatred of the people as standing between them and the benevolence of the Government of Her Majesty; as endeavouring, in their own interests, to obstruct measures having for their object the welfare of the people; and as embodying traditions and practices of oppression, and of disregard to popular claims, which, but for their existence and influence in India, would have long since been put an end to. I object to this, partly because, if without offence I may say so, it is not true. I object to it mainly because, while being untrue, it is eminently calculated to further the designs and promote the aims of those natives who are no less opposed to the Congress than disaffected to English rule in India, but who will gladly avail themselves of so useful a mechanism for stirring up discontent, and so safe a propaganda for the spread of the doctrine that British rule in India is a calamity. We may, as it seems to me, introduce changes, proved necessary by time, in the administration of India without, on that account, labouring to make the

masses deeply discontented with the Government hitherto accepted by them. Still more may we do so without misrepresenting the character of our countrymen in India, or the motives by which they are actuated. I object, finally, because I think that the measures themselves, so far as I have been enabled to judge of them, travel beyond anything for which the country is at present prepared ; or involve, if carried out in the direction which their promoters desire, a negation of true representation. If we are to have true representation we must be prepared to recur to an archaic order of ideas from which it is the great aim of the Government gradually to wean the people. If, on the other hand, we invite, as representatives of the vast majority, a class who are little less separated from that majority than we ourselves are, we add a fifth wheel to the coach. If, finally, we admit representation of "New India" we must give it no more weight than its numbers justify. Nobody is more willing than I am to recognize, and encourage, and find room under the Government of India umbrella for the younger men who, within the last 25 years, have, as you somewhere say, sprung into existence as a new factor in the country. But I cannot, on that account, affect to recognize in these forward spirits of the present generation the political maturity of all India ; or regard even this, the most advanced element, otherwise than as still in the stage of political babyhood. For I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that no nation, least of all a nation of the East, can be trusted, within less than the lifetime of a living man, to adopt and to put into practice conceptions of political life confined at present mainly to the Anglo-Saxon race ; and only by them elaborated after long and painful centuries.

23. You are at liberty to publish this letter if you publish it in its entirety. I should wish to exercise a similiar discretion with regard to it. I am afraid that it does not present my views to you exactly in the guise which, when you wrote to me, you anticipated. But you will not, on that account to recur to your own letter for a moment, think me capable of persecuting any man who differs from me in opinion. On the other hand, you will doubtless understand that I should not allow myself to be moved from conclusions which I have deliberately adopted, by the fact that they excite the opposition or even the ill-will of some of those who are subject to the Government of these Provinces. I should be only too glad to see those who direct the counsels of the Congress, return to the attitude which in its earlier days characterised it, and abandon the aggressive and hostile tone of their later publications. I believe that these inevitably must

provoke opposition, alienate from them many who, like myself, had hoped from them better things. Meanwhile, I shall personally watch their proceedings with the interest they deserve ; and follow the effects of their workings in these Provinces with the vigilance with which, as their head, I endeavour to inform myself of all public movements which show themselves within our limits.

Yours very sincerely,

A. COLVIN.

ROTHNEY CASTLE,
Simla, October 13th, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR AUCKLAND,

YESTERDAY I received your very kind and impressive letter and at once gratefully acknowledged its receipt. To-day I sit down to reply to it, and to facilitate this I have taken the liberty of numbering your paragraphs and by their numbers I shall refer to them.

2. Before, however, discussing any details, I desire at the outset to express my conviction that this letter of yours is one of the most valuable contributions to a right comprehension of this really important subject that have as yet appeared. Thus far everything worthy of consideration that has been written has been wholly in favour of the Congress. Anti-Congress utterances have, it is true, abounded, but they have been, without exception, more or less childish or violent in tone, illogical in method, and vitiated by either grave ignorance or serious misrepresentation of the real facts. Your calm and courteous exposition of your views, albeit these are based upon an imperfect knowledge of the facts, inaugurates a new era in the discussion, and though I may be, as you have anticipated, a little disappointed at your conclusions, I have no hesitation in saying that your letter deserves the most careful consideration of all interested in the Congress movement and embodies lessons that all may profit by.

3. I will not now waste your time by discussing the part taken by Sir Syed Ahmed in this Congress question. By me, as by you, he was long esteemed and respected as a friend; it is now close upon 30 years since I first learnt to value and believe in him. But I regret to say that facts, in connection with his recent action, have come to my notice which preclude my retaining any faith in his veracity, except on the hypothesis, which I gladly accept, that age has dimmed his once clear faculties, and that he is no longer altogether responsible for much that he says and does where the Congress is concerned.

4. Turning now to your 8th paragraph, I am glad to find (as, indeed, I knew was the fact from the tenor of your letter to me at Madras, in which you promised that the Congress should receive the same kindly welcome at your hands in Allahabad that it had received at Calcutta and Madras, from those of Lords Dufferin and Connemara), I am glad, I say, to

find that until very recently you saw little to object to, whether in the methods or the measures of the Congress. I am glad of this, because it affords grounds for hoping that, partly by the submission of fuller explanations on points in regard to which the whole of the facts scarcely seem to have been before you, and partly by a stricter adherence to those principles on which you insist, and in which we all agree (though mortal like we may not *always* fully act up to them), our movement may yet regain your entire sympathy.

5. I concede the absolute truth of your remarks that, when the work was commenced, it was questionable "whether, "in the present embryo-state of political life in India, "agitation, such as was encouraged by the operations of the "Congress, was not likely to cause some miscarriage of the "ends desired," and that "the experiment was quite new in "India, and the circumstances which surrounded it not wholly "favourable to its development;" and had it been possible, I, for one, should have been glad to see the inauguration of the movement postponed for some years. But, as has been repeatedly explained, no choice was left to those who gave the primary impetus to this movement. The ferment, the product of Western ideas, education, inventions and appliances, was at work with a rapidly increasing intensity, and it became of paramount importance to find for its products an overt and constitutional channel for discharge, instead of leaving them to fester, as they had already commenced to do, beneath the surface. I have always admitted that in certain provinces and from certain points of view the movement was premature, but from the most vital point of view, the future maintenance of the integrity of the British Empire, the real question when the Congress started was *not*, is it premature, but is it too late—will the country *now* accept it? That question, by God's blessing, the country has since answered in the affirmative, and a distinct danger, that a few years ago loomed, to all who could see below the surface, tremendous in the immediate future, has now passed away, almost, if not entirely, out of sight. For the Congress itself and its basal principles, no justification is needed to any one; and indeed it is only to some of its methods and measures that you yourself take objection; but if, as you imply, some justification is required for its inauguration in the *then* existing "embryo state of political life in India," it is to be found in the fact that, even then, a safety-valve for the escape of great and growing forces, generated by our own action, was urgently needed, and that no more efficacious safety-valve than our Congress movement could possibly be devised. I will add that, whatever was the case then, political life in India at the

present moment, taking the Empire as a whole, though still in its infancy, is far removed from the embryonic stage.

6. But when you go on to say that those persons who anticipated that we should shortly see the country divided into two or more strongly hostile camps were correct in their surmise, I must join issue with you and submit that you have been misinformed on this point. There are no two hostile camps at this moment. The whole culture and intelligence of the country, excluding an inappreciable fraction, are favourable to the Congress; as a native gentleman of high position and education said to me the other day: "How can any Indian avoid being "in heart favourable to the Congress? Is there one who does not "know that it is for the good of the country?" But no doubt there is a tiny knot of Anglo-Indians, mostly officials, whose organs, the *Englishman*, the *Pioneer* and *Civil and Military Gazette*, are; a few Indian fossils, honest, but wanting in understanding; a few men who in their hearts hate British rule or are secretly in the employ of England enemies, and a considerable number (though utterly insignificant when compared with the total population) of time-servers, men not really in their hearts opposed to the Congress, but who have taken up the work of opposition to it because it has seemed to them that this will "pay." They are very noisy and very active, and they send wonderful telegrams of their exploits to their patron, the *Pioneer*, but they are really insignificant in number and devoid of influence with their countrymen. You will say this is uncharitable, that it is an unwarrantable assumption on my part, but it is the *truth*, and how can I help saying it? A truth that before long we will prove by statistics. Again, we know all these men, their antecedents, the repute in which they were held before any one ever heard of the Congress; we do not say that they are time-servers *because* they go against the Congress, but only that they always have belonged to that type, and that being time-servers, and believing that they can thus win the favour of the officials (a great libel by the way on some, at any rate, of these) they now, naturally, act in opposition alike to the Congress and their own convictions.

7. Just look a little around you. Take the poor old Maharajah of Benares, who has been lately put forward to oppose the Congress. You know the dear old man as well as I do; neither you nor any honest English gentleman who does know him will pretend that he has the mental capacity to think out the simplest question for himself—intellectually he is an absolute cypher—kind and courteous, but absolutely unable to form any opinion for himself on any earthly subject. Of course the speech attributed to him was put into his mouth by his

factotum and General Manager, Rajah Siva Prasad. And who is *this* gentleman? A member of the old amla class, formerly a subordinate in Government employ, for many years, having got the measure of the poor old Maharajah's foot, the real "malik" of the vast Benares domains—as such, gifted with most agreeable manners and a keen eye to his own advancement, and as the virtual dispenser of the Maharajah's princely hospitality to European officials and globe-trotters, he has become a titular Rajah and has acquired a certain status amongst Europeans. But what native gentleman, from Calcutta to Peshawar, has one iota of respect for him? I do not deny a bit that personally and privately he is a most agreeable companion. I myself, despite all I know of him, cannot help liking him in a way; nay more, when he was the execration of the whole country and they burnt him in effigy, I thought he was being unjustly treated, and I actually went out of my way to go to Benares and spend a couple of days there in the hopes of being able to set him right with his countrymen. It seemed to me that it was hard that he was to be denied a right to his own opinion on the Ilbert Bill, and I thought that it was merely the attitude that he took up in regard to this Bill that had brought him into such disrepute. But I found that his speech on this subject merely furnished an opportunity for the expression of sentiments, engendered long previously by a more thorough knowledge of his character than I possessed.

8. Take the so-called Raja of Bhinga; does not the whole country know him? A gentleman who has succeeded in getting the personal title of Rajah; who is no more Rajah of Bhinga than I am*; a gentleman vastly anxious to become a person of note, who got some one to write an ostentatious "history of his family and house," gorgeously got up which he presented to all high officials, and who, unable to write a single page of really good English, gets some one to write for him letters to the *Times* which he signs (but which, unless well coached up in beforehand, I would challenge him to translate accurately into his own vernacular), and who has been pestering editors of papers, it is understood, to write him up for a seat in a Council. Now is there a single independent Indian who attaches the smallest weight to anything this gentleman says, or gets other people to say for him?

9. Take Munshi Naval Kishore; I would not be hard on him, for there are, as he explained to me, excuses for him, and his position is peculiar. But what was his character in native society before the Congress? Did any native believe in

* Of course he is only *a* recently created titular Rajah Udehy Pertab Sing, who chances to have become possessed of a portion of the estates of *the* real old Rajahs of Bhinga.

him, trust him, respect him? How did even the *Pioneer* then characterize him?

10. I might go on and deal one by one with the so-called leaders of the opposition, and I know that, with the exception possibly of Sir Syed Ahmed (of whom I will say nothing because I believe he is a little insane on the subject of the Congress) there is not one single one of them who *in any way* possessed either the respect or the confidence of his fellow-countrymen even before the Congress question arose. But, as a matter of fact, you must know this as well as I do, and besides this, I feel that you will be only too likely to set me down as uncharitable, or to remind me that this plain-speaking is not calculated to promote that concord and brotherly feelling that I aim at. Yet, after all, have I set down ought in malice? Have I said one word about these gentlemen that you could deny on oath in a Court of Justice? And I am not *playing* at this matter. I am in deadly earnest; for it I have abandoned all the scientific persuits that made the pleasure of my life—to it I am devoting my whole time and fortune—to it I am almost giving my life, because I believe that on the successful evolution of the movement depends alike the happiness of millions on millions, and, in no small measure, the future progress and prosperity, not only of India, but also of the British Empire; and am I to escape the pain of some little plain-speaking to allow a mere handful (for they are no more really) of men, who neither possess, nor deserve, the confidence or the respect of the bulk of their fellow-countrymen, to impose upon you, and other good men like you, with the pretence of their being an opposition party, a strong opposing camp? Were I to do this I should be shirking my duty; and this, moreover, is to me a vital point; for if, really, the Congress had divided or could divide the country into two strong opposing factions, I would have nothing more to do with it. But the fact is that, despite the frantic and unprincipled efforts (here again, because you do not know the facts, you will say I am uncharitable, but it is the truth) of some, specially the Wahabi followers of Sir Syed Ahmed, to get up rows and fights over the matter, and so, if possible, give our movement the bad name due to their own misdeeds. I say despite all this, the Congress, instead of dividing, is uniting, is binding up old wounds, and bringing together in harmonious co-operation men who previously scarcely met except to quarrel and even at times fight. It is only the other day that an enlightened Mahomedan gentleman, enlightened though he has had no English education, wrote to me from Salem, till recently a very hotbed of Hindu and Mahomedan religious antagonism, blessing the Congress, and saying that if it had done nothing else it had now brought together into

kindly relations *all the* people of Salem, Mahomedans and Hindus, and that if it had not already rendered quite impossible any recurrence of those terrible scenes that Salem witnessed a few years ago, it soon would, as the people were beginning to understand something of their rights and duties as citizens, something of their real interests, and to realize that they must not fight amongst themselves, but rather join hands in a common effort to persuade Government to redress their common grievances. The whole so-called opposition is hollow, making a great show but based upon misrepresentations and possessing no appreciable substance. It is only the Europeans, for the most part, who are deceived by these empty shows. Take the absurd story put forward by the Anglo-Indian papers that Sir Syed Ahmed is the Mahomedan leader of the Mahomedans. Why no orthodox Mahomedan will allow that he is a Mahomedan at all. They may and will join in secular matters, with Christians, Hindus, Parsees, and any other set of infidels who are not disrespectful to their religion, but they neither can nor will follow nor join him in any matter, because he is in their eyes a pervert. The fact is that his religious views as set forth in his commentary on the Bible, &c., in their eyes involve Atheism, and hence the Fatwahs denouncing him and his opinions. Pray do not think that I am imputing any blame to him for this ; on the contrary I have always admired him for having the courage of his convictions, and I, myself, occupy a precisely similar position. For while I call and consider myself a Christian, believing Christ's cardinal doctrine that on the love of God and love of man "hang all the Law and the Prophets," and recognizing his as the most perfect type of the divine-human life, humbly endeavour, however unsuccessfully, to imitate afar of that life, the great bulk of orthodox Christians will not allow that I am a Christian at all, because I am unable to accept many of the fundamental dogmas of the majority of the churches, *as they are now undeistood and preached in these.* Thus I am the last person to blame Sir Syed Ahmed in this respect ; but then I do not go amongst the Hindus and claim to be a Christian leader of orthodox Christians. The idea that Sir Syed Ahmed *can* be, in any matter, the leader of any appreciable fraction of the orthodox Mahomedans is a pure delusion, and a delusion confined almost exclusively to Europeans, though of course the Anti-Congress knot of natives, seeing how it goes down with the officials, put it forward as strongly as they can.

11. I have dwelt at some length on this point (although I have not said half that might be said on the subject), because it is really of vital importance that you should, if possible,

realize how extremely unsubstantial and unreal is the so-called Anti-Congress Party. It owes its existence almost wholly to the promptings and support of a small but influential section of the Anglo-Indian Party. It has not the sincere heart-felt support of five men per million of the population of the empire, and despite its show and swagger, and the persistent falsehoods promulgated by the *Pioneer* and its *clientêle, et id genus omne*, and the magnificent donations of Native Princes who, because Sir Syed Ahmed dates from and remains at Nynee Tal, believe him to be your mouthpiece and you to be acting in concurrence with the Viceroy (a pure slander on both of you, but none the less widely believed, will, within the next three years, become universally known as what it really is and virtually collapse.

12. In most of the rest of your remarks in para. 8 I quite concur. It is undeniable that when the first Congress was held the people of the United Provinces knew and cared nothing about representative institutions, the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State, Volunteering, and the like. But along with this, if we are to understand the matter rightly, we must consider three other facts. First, that these United Provinces were, with Sindh, the most backward Provinces, politically speaking, in the empire, and that when there was an urgent pressure for moving elsewhere, the whole country could not be kept back on account of the backwardness of one or two portions. Second, that though there was absolutely no knowledge of the particular measures you refer to, or indeed of any general or abstract proposition, there was a widespread feeling that things were not going right, that times were becoming hard, a feeling that would have grown into disaffection had it not been made clear to the people that legitimate and constitutional methods existed by which they could get such changes brought about in the administration as would enable them to get their grievances and discomforts and disappointed expectations, ventilated and thoroughly considered. Third, that though four years ago the case was as you state, now you can hardly find a village of even 500 inhabitants in this whole territory in which there are not some few, at any rate (in some you will find scores), who understand a great deal about the Congress, and realize that the introduction of some representative element into the administration would be a boon to them and to the country.

13. Again, nothing can be more true than that the idea (in which, as you say, you fully sympathize, as with your liberal views you necessarily must) of placing the Legislative Councils on a more popular and broader basis had been before the minds

of high authorities here before the Congress party had ever been heard of and quite independently of their initiative. But for this fact, and the knowledge that many of the broadest-minded Anglo-Indian statesmen favoured this view, the Congress would never have been able to bring it forward with the confidence which they did. But here too it must be borne in mind that, if there are broad-minded, there are also narrow-minded statesmen ; that if a few of the best men favoured this view, a great number of the second best disapproved it ; that noble views may, under such circumstances, remain a very, very long period, still in a viewy stage, without attaining any practical embodiment, and that the great service rendered by the Congress Party has been to strengthen the hands of these pioneers of thought, by teaching large sections of the community the value of these views, and then bringing home to large numbers of influential men here and in England that an appreciable portion of the community here really desired, and would receive with gratitude, those reforms which these high authorities, to whom you refer, had long since conceived to be right or expedient. From the very nature of the case, no political measure that has actually come like this one, within the sphere of practical politics, can ever possibly retain in it any flavour of originality ; but does it not seem to you, on reconsideration, a little illogical to taunt us, as you do, however gently and kindly, with a lack of originality, when any such originality in our proposals would be our gravest condemnation? No, the Congress Party claim no originality, and the measures that they put forward are only such as have been for years and years not only in the minds of, but frankly discussed between, the best and wisest men ; only such, in a word, as after a long embryotic stage have emerged fully organized for practical existence.

14. To return, after explaining that until quite recently you viewed the Congress movement with no disfavour and even sympathised with one of its main proposals, you tell me that since the issue of the Report of the Madras Session of the Congress the sympathy with which you had hitherto regarded the movement has received a severe check. You quote my speech at Allahabad and say that in the pamphlets reprinted as appendices to the 3rd Congress Report, you find no trace of what I state, *viz.*, that " the people are taught to recognize the " many benefits that they owe to British rule, as also the " fact that in the peaceful continuance of that rule depend all " hopes for the peace and prosperity of the country. They are " taught that the many hardships and disabilities of which they " complain are, after all, though real enough, small in comparison

"with the blessings they enjoy." Of all this you say you find nothing in the pamphlets.

Now, surely, this is the most unfair argument, if you only reconsider it, that could possibly be advanced. I speak of the verbal lectures, of which I had heard several, and which are all modelled on Mr. Dadabhai's Calcutta speech; you quote what I say of these, you elide a long passage necessary to the right appreciation of what follows, and then you apply to the pamphlets what I said of the lectures, and reprove me, (yes, reprove me, however delicately) because you do not find in the pamphlets what I said formed one main staple of the lectures, and this though even in my speech I had carefully drawn a distinction between the two and had said that the pamphlets only referred to the rights and duties of subjects. Here are my very words:—

"Second, amongst our methods, is the distribution of ele-
"mentary tracts setting forth similar doctrines and embodying
"teachings conceived in a light spirit in regard to the rights
"and duties of subjects."

And what, pray, are the similar doctrines and teachings conceived in a like spirit in *regard to the rights and duties of subjects?* To show this I must quote the passage which you have elided: "They are taught," I there say, "that all these
"grievances may be and will be redressed if they all join to
"press their views and wishes unanimously, but temperately, on
"the Government here and on the Government and people of
"England. The sin of illegal or anarchical proceedings
"is brought home to them, and the conviction is en-
"gendered that by united, patient, constitutional agitation,
"they are certain ultimately to obtain all they can reasonably
"or justly ask for, while by any recourse to hasty or
"violent action they must inevitably ruin their cause and
"entail endless misery on themselves."

And are not these points clearly pressed in the pamphlets? Let me quote a few passages only:—

"And if we persevere with these Congresses, and get
"more and more of the people everywhere to understand them,
"and take interest in them, and support them, we shall, and
"that before many years are over, have so strong a voice that
"even the people of England will hear us, and once they do
"this as a body (not merely two or three thousands here and
"there, whom alone, as yet, we have reached), all our reasonable
"demands will soon be granted." (*Congress Catechism.*)

* * * * * *

"But if we could once make the English nation at home (who

"have none of the prejudices on these matters that Europeans "who have lived long out here so often insensibly contract), un- "derstand that we are no longer all of us children ; that thanks to "their education, numbers of us now are quite fitted by our "superior local knowledge, not only to fill a great majority of "the posts now held by Europeans, and discharge the duties "thereof far more satisfactorily than these, by reason of being "foreigners, possibly can, but even to instruct and advise in "most matters of domestic administration, they would at once, "through their 'REPRESENTATIVES,' insist upon our associa- "tion in the work of governing the country on a much larger "scale than at present, and on the concession to us of some "form of 'REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS.' To many of the "best and highest of them the fact that the Government of "India is still, what they so greatly dislike, *viz.*, "DESPOTIC," "is a source of real regret, and they would gladly accept any "reasonable evidence that the continuance of such a system "was no longer necessary. Besides this, even those who are "less liberal and less high-minded are sensible. Practical com- "mon sense is the leading characteristic of the British nation; "they no perfectly well that it is better to rule a contented "than a dontented people, and one of their own holy texts "says that a dinner of herbs where peace is, is better than the "grandest banquet where there is strife ; and if once they saw "us all, high and low, banded together and determined to "obtain these 'REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS,' then they "have too much common sense not to allow us to have them." (*Conversation.*)

* * * * * *

"RAMBAKSH.—But surely you don't want us to join together and fight with the *sircar* ? If we killed all the Europeans how should we get along ? All would be anarchy (*ghader*), as I remember when I was young. You cannot mean this.

"MOULVI FARIDUDDIN.—God forbid ! This would be a sin. Why should we kill the poor Europeans ! Many of them are really good men ; most of them *mean* at any rate to do right. They are ignorant no doubt of the rights of most matters concerning us ; they blunder, they cause us misery, but they do it from ignorance—from an ignorance unavoidable under the system which they work on, and which, even did they wish it, they could not change without our help. Besides, though we of the new generation are growing up able to assist them and do much for the country, the whole of us put together have not yet sufficient experience and self-reliance to manage the administration entirely without their help. Kill the Europeans ! No, Rambaksh ; let us say, rather, God bless all of them (and

there are many such) who feel kindly towards us in their hearts, and according to their lights mean well towards us, and God forgive those amongst them (and let us hope they are *not* many) who dislike and despise us, and care nothing what becomes of us." (*Conversation.*)

And yet you want to make out that the pamphlets do not contain what I have stated of them. Now I know you too well not to know that you had no intention of being thus unjust to me, but none the less see what a grievous injustice you have mentally done me by applying to one thing what I said of another and dropping out the passage which made the whole clear.

15. And, of course, the audiences addressed by lecturers and by the pamphlets are wholly different. The former may comprise largely ignorant and illiterate persons on whom it *is* necessary to impress the advantages of British rule; whereas the latter can only reach persons who know all about Education, Railroads, Post Offices, Telegraphs, Canals, and the Pax Brittanica, and to whom it would be a waste of time to re-explain all these things which they already thoroughly realize.

16. A great deal, therefore, of what you say in regard to the pamphlets is written under a mistake, but in para. 10 you state the general conclusion that they are *not* "kindly and loyal alike in spirit and word." Here I am compelled to differ from you, but our difference of opinion in this case will be found to be based, not on the pamphlets themselves, but on the different views we take of the merits and demerits of the existing form of administration. You, I can clearly see from the eloquent exordium that follows your remarks just referred to, still look upon our government of the country through those rose-tinted official spectacles that so long obscured my sight. But leave the service, become a nobody, mix freely with the people, hear what they have to say when not afraid to speak their minds, study the reverse of the shield, and knowing you as I do, I know well that you would wholly change your views. As a fact, putting aside the most excellent *intentions*, what we have chiefly to be proud of are, the Education, the liberty of the Press, the Railways, Telegraphs, Post Offices and Canals, and the general peace that we have given to the country. Are these small things? No! very great and grand things, but notwithstanding all these India, in some respects, is still an extremely badly-governed country. In practice, despite those grand codes, revenue, civil and criminal, on which you dwell later with pride, there is very little real justice to be obtained, and that little has to be paid for dearly. Despite all courts and codes, the poor can hardly ever get redress against the rich, the non-official

against the official. We have courts of law by the hundred and the grandest system ever devised for extracting money from all foolish or unfortunate enough to enter them, but courts of justice outside the five or six High Courts are few and far between.

Our Police system is a disgrace to us, and I truly believe that the steady, daily, all-pervading oppression that the Police exercise everywhere is even harder for the people to bear than were the raids in olden times, once or twice perhaps in the lifetime of any villager, of the Pindarees or Mahrattas. For the rich money-lender no doubt the change has been a glorious one, but as to the masses, they are, I believe, worse off in this matter than their great grandfathers.

A large number, an appreciable proportion, of our European officials are utterly unfit for the responsible positions they hold, are not only wholly unsympathetic with the people, altogether careless of their comfort and happiness, entirely engrossed in their own selfish schemes, but in virtue of the existing unconstitutional and illogical union of the executive and judicial functions are not unfrequently guilty of acts of oppression and injustice, which ought to ensure, though they do not, their expulsion from the service of Government.

The way in which, in many provinces, the Arms Act and Forest Act have been worked have been productive of the most widespread and undeserved suffering.

The Revenue laws, despite the efforts to do justice to the peasants that have characterized the passing of some of the more recent of them, have by their hard and fast character entailed misery on millions, and in not a few provinces their unsuitability to the characters alike of the soil, the climate and the people, have reduced the great mass of the agriculturists from comparative prosperity to almost absolute poverty.

The militant policy of the Government and its extravagant employment of a non-indigenous agency have entailed upon the country a weight of debt and taxation almost exceeding its capacity to sustain, and as a result of these and the heavy and constant drain of Home charges and a general want of adaptation of the administration to the actual needs of the country, this latter is growing poorer and poorer year by year, and year by year are the millions of our half-fed proletariat increasing.

To me it seems a disgrace to England that in her grandest dependency the despotism she so persistently execrates where other nations are concerned should still survive, and that tens

of thousands of educated and experienced men, Europeans, Eurasians and natives of the country, should still remain debarred from political rights which are the birthright of every free-born British subject, and should still, like dumb-driven cattle, be taxed and subjected to all kinds of laws, without being permitted the smallest voice in either matter.

17. We have done great things for India, no doubt, but almost equally great things, *and these beyond our unaided power*, still remain to be done. The fact is, our administration looks better on paper than it is in practice; it always reminds me of Porthos' belt, grandly gold embroidered in front but very plain, somewhat ragged, leather behind. It is in some respects more ornamental exteriorly than the poverty of the interior material warrants. No one has a greater admiration than myself for the kindly and sympathetic impulse that prompted Lady Dufferin to inaugurate the association for providing medical aid to the women of India, but this loveable effort always sadly recalls to me, when I think of our half-starving proletariat of forty or fifty millions, that sweet and innocent victim of previous bureaucratic misgovernment (not wholly unlike our own) who desired to give cake to a population howling for bread. These are but the tithes of mint and cummin; it is to the weightier matters of the law that we have first to look. We want justice, cheap, sure, speedy and close to each man's door; we want a police that the people may look up to and rely on as friends and protectors, as much as they now hate and fear our present police as foes and robbers; we want a reform in the quality of our European agency, a careful weeding out of the unsuitables and the separation of the judicial and executive functions; we want a far more liberal and intelligent administration of the Arms and Forest Acts, so that, without compromising the public peace or the welfare of posterity, the men of the present day may be exempted from harsh restrictions on the exercise of necessary rights long antedating our rule, and from the destruction of their crops, their families and themselves by wild beasts. We require an altogether more elastic and sympathetic land-revenue system, based far more on systematic arbitration amongst the people themselves than on Codes and Courts and their rigid mechanical procedure; we want a non-aggressive foreign policy and an absolute abstention from Burmese annexations, Tibetan and such like wars, frontier tribe expeditions and the like; we want relief from many inequitable home charges, some of which ought to cease, and for the rest of which the British nation, as all the really honestest men amongst them admit, ought itself to pay; we want a vast reduction in the foreign agency employed, and the substitution of a

national force, partly militia, partly volunteers, for at least half of the 70,000 European troops we are now condemned to pay for; and, not to weary you with a full list of our grievances, we desire that every non-official, without distinction of race, creed or caste, intelligent enough to understand such matters, should, through his representatives, have a voice in regard to all matters affecting his own, his country's, or his fellow-countrymen's welfare.

18. And here I feel that you will ask, almost indignantly, whether in many of these matters we have not persistently done *our* best to secure for the country what I have set forth as its wants. I reply unhesitatingly in the affirmative. We have, many of us, I believe, done our very best, and if we have failed lamentably, as we *have* failed, in these matters, it has been due to no lack of good intention on the part of the best and noblest of our officials, but solely to the fact that aliens and foreigners, differing in manners, habits, methods of thought, traditions and all that makes up nationality, from the people over whom we rule, we are absolutely incompetent, without their full co-operation and guidance, to mould our administration and frame our institutions here in accordance with the real requirements of the country. This is one of the *raisons d'être* of the Congress movement.

19. Now if two men sit down to a dinner, one of whom is the cook, it may be natural that the latter should look upon it as first rate, whereas the other, who has had no finger in the pie, may think it in some respects execrable, and then, equally naturally, the criticisms of this latter, though really kindly and indulgent and by no means making the worst of the matter, must appear to the artist, who is thoroughly satisfied with his own performance, not only unkind and unjust, but altogether abominable. That a considerable portion of the European officials should deny the loyalty and kindliness of these two pamphlets is only natural, but that *you* should be amongst the number is a matter of equal regret and surprise to me, for it shows, as does your enthusiastic description of what the British Government has done for India, that you do not by any means yet realize how very defective, despite all this, our administration still is. This you will say is a matter of opinion, but the only opinion worth a straw in such a case is the opinion of the people, and the entire intelligence of the country will endorse every word that I have said in regard to each of the crying defects in our rule that I have pointed out. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and it is the people who have to eat our pudding, and they know ten times better than you or I, or Lord Dufferin, or any other European, how great and serious the defects in our administration really are.

20. Having thus indicated the Indian view (and, as I believe, the absolutely correct and true one) of the state of affairs which the pamphlets have to deal with, I desire to reply more directly to your criticisms. Virtually you say they are not loyal because everything that is said in favour of the Government is obscured by the thickness and depth of the darker shades of the picture, because they grievously misrepresent the British administration in India, and because they ascribe to this wrongs, or rather sufferings, without precautions taken to prevent ignorant and illiterate men from being tempted to impute to that administration all that is hard and disagreeable in their lives. I marvel that you can make such a statement in face of passages like the following:—

"But don't you run away with the idea that when we get "'REPRESENTATION' *all* injustice and oppression, all poverty "and distress, are to cease. This it can never do, unless and "until all men are good and kind and wise, and that won't be "in our time, Mukkadamji. All we can promise is that the "amount of the afflictions will be greatly diminished, and a "very great check imposed on the evil omissions or deeds of "men like Rajah Sahib and the Sheikh."

Or again: "And may I say this more—'REPRESENTATIVE "INSTITUTIONS' we shall get, but if we are to get all the good "that is possible out of these, we must not only induce others "to do justice to us, but we must do justice to *ourselves*. It "is not merely by political enfranchisement that a people rises; "they must grow in goodness as they grow in power, or evil "will come of it; and while we band together to struggle against "'DESPOTIC INSTITUTIONS,' we must each and all, in our inmost "hearts, resolve, and keep that resolve, to live henceforth "better lives, to love our fellow-men more, and gradually sink "the all-absorbing interest in our own selfish cares in a wider "and nobler interest in the welfare and the progress of our "country and our fellow-countrymen."

In the face of distinct and emphatic warnings like these, I do not see how even illiterate and ignorant men could possibly attribute *all* their ills to the blunders of the British administration. But, as I have already explained, these pamphlets are not addressed and cannot reach the illiterate and ignorant, but only that massive lower middle class, most of whom can read and write, and who are highly intelligent, although they lack wholly Western culture. You, it seems, in common with so many officials, undervalue the mental capacity of our better class common people, because they dare not open their mouths and become utterly stupefied before you; but there

are at this moment at least ten millions of these, any one of whom (might he meet you face to face as an equal, without any fear of consequences) could, though he knows no language but his mother-tongue, and is possibly by no means clear as to the Viceroy's name, silence you, great and able as you are, in half an hour, from his own experiences, as to the practical difficulty of getting justice, as to the cruel oppression of the Police, as to the hardness and iniquity in practice of our Revenue Codes, as to the pressure of taxation, the hardships entailed by our Arms and Forest laws, &c. If you think that the people do not know and feel bitterly about all these things, if you think that they do not speak in far harsher and less measured terms about all these matters, amongst themselves, than we speak of them in the pamphlets, then you are still living, I fear, in a dreamland outside the realities of this work-a-day world of ours, accepting what we should *all wish* to be, for what really *is*, and scarcely sufficiently realize what is going on, everywhere, below the delusive surface of our official veneer.

21. You make it in the same passage, though I have not, I see, quoted the words, a charge against us that we nowhere define the sufferings to which we refer. Now is this reasonable, considering that we are addressing the people who are suffering? If you meet a man whose face shows suffering, who tells you that his shoe is hurting him, and who asks you how he can obtain relief, do you sit down first to define the exact points where that shoe pinches? He knows that already too well! On the contrary, you, seeing that the fault lies in the hardness of the leather and its failure to adapt itself to the natural contour of the foot, tell him at once that all he has to do is to soften it by thoroughly impregnating it with some emollient, when the undue and galling pressure at many points will cease, and the softened leather will automatically adapt itself to the foot. Moreover, unless you are very unwise, you do not begin by telling him that the shoe is *not* hurting him—on the contrary you say "poor fellow, you are suffering sadly, "I see, but you have only got to do this, and you will be ever "so much easier, but mind this won't cure that whitlow on your "finger." And such is our course in the pamphlets; we do not weary him by defining his grievances which he already knows too well; we do not pretend he is not suffering when he and we both know he *is* suffering, but we tell him the truth that a great deal of his pain is due to the rigid, inelastic, unconformable character of our administration, and that this can be remedied by impregnating it with an emollient Indian and national element, and we tell him how to set to work to bring this

about. Thus we not only put him in the way of securing relief but we leave him with hope in his heart, the only true antidote to that bitterness (which the most trivial circumstance may convert into a still more dangerous feeling) which springs from suffering for which no remedy but self-destruction seems possible.

22. This, I submit, is true wisdom; we do not blink or pretend to ignore the grave evils that exist; to do this, to our ideas, would be, not Loyalty, but something of a very different character, though both words begin with an "L." We don't paint our picture *couleur-de-rose*, because it would not be true, and because he knows the case so well that he would merely laugh at us, but we put the case in far milder language than he uses amongst his fellows, and the thickness and depth of the darker shades of our picture are the very smallest that he, or any one who understands what the people really suffer, can be persuaded to accept as true to nature. Is it possible that you fail to realize that, despite our beneficent intentions, despite our glorious achievements and all the material blessings of one class that these have paved the way for, the internal administration of the country, where justice, police, taxation and poverty are concerned (and these are the main things to the middle and lower classes) is an almost hopeless muddle, a "mere *eidolon* and sham?"

23. We are face to face with misery and misgovernment in every direction—a misery and misgovernment that is the talk amongst themselves of the leading men in every hamlet. They acknowledge and are grateful for the many unquestionably fine things we have done for them, but they are not altogether the ignorant and illiterate mass you fancy them, and in every hamlet there are men, the natural leaders of the rest who equally recognize and grumble over the many bad things they have to put up with by reason of our well-intentioned ignorance of how to fit our burthen properly to their backs. In our pamphlets we approach these intelligent men with sympathy, we admit their grievances, but we put them in a milder shape than they themselves do; we tell them that the "The English Government is superior to all other "Governments in the world, for its fundamental principle is to "shape its policy according to the wishes of the people." We tell them emphatically (in a passage which you yourself quote at the close of your 12th para.) that it is not the individual governors or officials who are to blame for the shortcomings of the administration, but the system, the form of that administration; and we further show them how, by loyal and constitutional efforts, they can secure the amelioration of

that system, and a remedy for many of the evils they have to contend against. Now I submit—and I believe that in England, at any rate, the vast majority of thinking men will agree with me—that this is the *only* wise and loyal course. But if you are really still able to persuade yourself that the internal administration of the country is, on the whole, very satisfactory, while I *know* that in many respects it is little better than a chaos, and that, in just those matters which touch the bulk of the population most closely, justice, police and taxation, its defects and their consequences are grievous to a degree, how can we ever agree as to what is the loyal manner of dealing with the case?

24. And the tone of the pamphlets is not kindly. I think the tone of the last quotation in my 14th para., eminently kindly. I think the following, which illustrates what good district officers and their wives are and may be (mind such people are merely a blessed minority), equally kindly in tone.

"RAMBAKSH.—That is very true no doubt, *Moulvi Sahib*, "and our Collector *Sahib* is a good man, and in the bad fever "here, a year ago, he came out himself, and with his own hands "gave quinine to many, and his lady herself helped to nurse "my little girl (the one I married this year to Ramrutton's "son, you know), and he stopped a whole week here, though it "was the rains, and he spoke kindly to all. Yes! he is a good "man."

But, unfortunately, at this moment, there are not in your whole great Government of the United Provinces more than six European officials of whom the people, amongst themselves, speak as highly as Rambaksh does of his Collector. There are a few others that are liked, but there are widely known blemishes in their lives that militate against that liking, and there are a greater number that the people dislike or despise even more than they fear them, while as to the major portion of the officials they are nothing to the people and the people are nothing to them. And in this we find a clue, not only to much of the maladministration from which the people suffer, but to the entire failure to realise this suffering which pervades the official mind, and which, I cannot but surmise from your tone, must be, to some extent, shared by you. The silver chord of sympathy which once, to some extent, bound together rulers and ruled has snapped; our district officers as a body no longer love or lean upon their people, and the people no longer love or rely upon them, and the consequence is that, despite their energy, industry and ability, their paid *mokbirs* (informers) and the inevitable clique of visiting toadies, who have ever the rupee ready for the *huzoor's* orderly's itching palm, our district

officers (and necessarily our more exalted officials who can only learn anything through these) are as ignorant of what the people really think, feel and suffer, as if they had chambers in the Albany and lived and worked there. I am not sure that the administration would suffer if one-half of our district officers really did this. They would be living in a healthier moral atmosphere and would no longer be, as they so often now are, the unconscious tools of small and evil cliques.

25. I read with pleasure the passages that in this same para. 10 you quote from the Catechism in reference both to the attitude of many of the Anglo-Indian officials and the general character of the existing Legislative Councils. I re-read these passages with the greatest care, and cannot discover in them one word that should be even modified. They appear to me (and, let me note, I had nothing earthly to do with them, as they were written by Mr. Viraragava Chariar in Madras and approved by the Committee, when I was in Simla, and published and circulated without my ever seeing them) they appear to me, I say, to embody the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, as completely as it is possible for any human writing to do so.

26. But when in your 11th para. you come to state your objections to these passages, you must forgive me if I say, to use an expressive colloquialism, that you seemed to me to get a little mixed. When pray did we ever say that the big useless men so often put in former times into Council (since the Hon'ble S. Subramania's speech at the first Congress much greater care has been exercised in this matter everywhere) would not show fight if you tried to meddle with their own personal rights and privileges? Even the worm when trodden on will turn, and even Rajah Rampal Singh's good uncle of pious memory would not have held up his hand along with the Viceroy had it been made clear to him that what the Viceroy was advocating involved serious loss to him, the Rajah, personally. According to your own showing the Bengal Zemindars and Oudh Taluqdars were not trying to do any good to the country (which is what we said such men rarely fight for), but only struggling strenuously for their own personal interests; and did we ever accuse them of any want of readiness to do this? And when again did we say that the measures of Government are opposed to the rights of the people as a general assertion? That they have been so in many cases I would not deny, but the general tenor of the pamphlets goes to show that this arises, as a rule, from failure to realize the whole of the facts of the case.

27. You refer to these two acts as a triumphant vindication of these Councils as a reality—why, they are a standing

proof of our assertion that these are a sham. Over the details of these measures there was doubtless a good deal of wrangling, and here and there illogical additions were made in the Bengal Tenancy Bill which made it about as clumsy and contradictory an enactment as we have on the statute book. As passed, it contained sections absolutely irreconcileable, and if they have not yet passed an amending Act (I do not follow the proceedings in such minor matters of the Council) they will soon have to do so. If you do not believe *me*, ask Mr. Macdonnell, or any other of the Bengal men, who really know the subject in practice. But I say, despite the so-called strenuous efforts and strong opposition (which did not affect the main result in the least), the principles of the bills, the real points at issue, had all been determined in the Executive Council. So far as essentials were concerned, the submission of the bills to the Legislative Council, and all the Committees and the debates, were a sham. All the strenuous exertions, all the strong opposition of the Zemindars and Taluqdars, did not result in modifying, in any essential point, the views of the Executive.

28. You are very jubilant about these two bills, but I am by no means sure that the people share your good opinion of them. So far as the Bengal Tenancy Act is concerned, I am informed that a large majority of the agriculturists of all classes, more or less, disapprove and dislike it. As to the Oudh bill, I know as yet nothing about what the zemindars and ryots think of it; probably it has hardly yet come home to these latter. But one of the greatest Taluqdars told me here the other day that it was pure confiscation, and that it created what, broadly speaking, never had existed in Oudh—occupancy rights. I know that an infinite amount of honest labour was bestowed on both bills, but I know that, so long as an English executive, not largely tempered by a native element, determines the principles of bills of this class, and an English majority practically determines their form, such labours will never either elicit or deserve the gratitude of the people.

29. The concluding passages of your eleventh para., so far from refuting, entirely confirm all that is alleged about many of the nominated Native Members of the Council. No one, for one moment, questioned their readiness to oppose Government in cases where their own pockets are to be roughly touched; these are very exceptional cases that occur once in a lifetime. What is contended, and that you admit, is that in all matters which do not touch their own personal interests they are apathetic, as you call it, subservient to Government and utterly careless of the welfare of their countrymen, as we consider it,

and what we say is, that in the case of elected members these would have to drop alike that strenuous energy where their own pockets were concerned and that apathy where the welfare of every one else is at stake, or we, their constituents, would know the reason why.

30. Turning now to your 12th para. I feel greater difficulty in discussing the Conversation, because of this I am the author, and cannot feel sure, therefore, that I am impartial in thinking it very good, and in being prepared to defend and maintain every word it contains.

But let me set you right on one point. Rajah Harbansrai is not the Government of India, but the Government of England, a personification, if you like, of the House of Commons. Having quoted a passage, pregnant as it seems to me with truth, you remark that under the "rule" (of the officials here, who hold their office in virtue of authority delegated to them directly or indirectly by the Government of England) "ignorant people" (not so very ignorant, please, but intelligent men, who in their practical experience in the matters in question would put most of us to shame) "are invited by this pamphlet "to believe that they are growing poorer and poorer." And are they not? And is not this all due to our ignorance as foreigners of how best to adjust the details of internal administration? That we more earnestly and sincerely desire the good of the people (though the good we desire is *our* idea of good, not theirs) than perhaps any previous rulers may be conceded; that by our education we are raising them, and that by our practical applications of the science of the West we have been able to afford them facilities of communication, and the like, undreamt of in the past, can be denied by no one. Why then are the people, as a whole, less well off? Why is real justice more difficult to obtain? Why is the Police more persistently oppressive and extortive? Why does the land yield a smaller produce than in the time of Akbar? Simply because the whole scheme of our administration has become, especially during the last thirty years, too centralized, to Europeanized, too foreign to the genius of the people; because in all our efforts, even in the noblest of these, even in edcuation, we have blundered and worked too persistently on our own lines, too little on theirs and through them. And now it is too late to retrace our steps; we have practically obliterated the old system, we have hastily set forces in action whose growth will be irresistible, and all we can do both towards guiding these to the good of India and the glory of England, and towards remedying that internal maladministration which has resulted from our well-intentioned but unsuitable systems, is to associate with ourselves, as rapidly and

as largely as possible, the best and ablest of the natives themselves, alike in our legislation and administration.

31. *Au reste*, no reasonable man ever claims to push an illustration to its utmost verbal limits—Kambakhtpur, Shamshpur, Satyanas Kheyra, and the leading characters are drawn from life and introduced as concrete illustrations of abstract propositions. Nay, the conversation itself is not wholly imaginary ; indeed, though re-arranged and shorn of remarks by Rambaksh, to which objection might reasonably be taken, it rather closely follows a conversation that actually occurred some three years ago in one of the villages of your own Province. But because in their main features these villages aptly illustrated the difference between the despotic and constitutional systems, and were thus prominently brought forward, and because Rambaksh said in the quaint, half-joking, half-sad and serious way that our villagers have, that if he and the rest of his co-villagers were cattle they might make a rupee or two out of their skins, which was about all they had left, it is really too much of a good thing to pretend that the pamphlet teaches that *all* the people of India have little left but their skins, though, unfortunately, this *is* the case with some forty odd millions of them.

32. You proceed to quote further from the pamphlet and then say (para. 13) "the Government of India is here de-"scribed as a Despotic Govenment, which, except by a misuse "of the term, as usually applied, it is not." Well, if I err in this matter, at least I err in good company. I can remember at least three Viceroys, on different occasions, reminding me that "ours is a Despotic Government," and by a really extraordinary coincidence, as I was writing the foregoing paragraph, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Panjab came in quite unexpectedly (he is going down on Monady) to have a little talk with me about the Congress movement, in regard to the *ultimate* results of which he also has some doubts, although on wholly different grounds to those taken by you. In the course of conversation he said : "Of course our Government is a despotism." I said : "Certainly." "But," said he, "like all others, tempered by fear." I said : "I don't think *that* is quite true of our Govern-"ment ; I should say tempered by good intentions." He said : "As to the good intentions, there can be no doubt, but I still "think that if you carefully review the past you will agree that "my definition is the more correct." Now, whether he or I are nearer the truth as regards this latter point, at any rate he no more doubted that our Government was a despotism than I did, nor than any other thinking man with whom I have ever discussed the matter has done. In finding fault with me for describing the Government of India as a despotism, you will, I

believe, find yourself almost alone amongst closely reasoning and accurately thinking men (amongst whom I fully admit that you must be numbered), and I can only conclude that in this particular instance you have allowed your mind to import into your conception of a despotism, the cruelty, and wilful oppression that in some countries have accompanied this form of rule. Ours is neither a wicked nor a cruel despotism; it is a well-intentioned and benign despotism, *but* a despotism none the less.

33. Then you go on to say that our final conclusions are based upon four propositions, which you (is it possible?) apparently consider doubtful, and you go on to explain that the onus of proof of all these rests with us, and that until some serious effort is made to establish these we must expect a considerable section of the community here and elsewhere to hesitate to accept these conclusions. Let me first say that I do expect that the unenlightened conservative section of mankind, the good folks whose cry is *super antiquas vias stare*, will hesitate, nay will refuse, to accept our conclusions. What reform has ever yet been mooted that they did not oppose? Alike in art and literature, in science and in politics, from the days when Galileo (to go no further back) was persecuted for setting forth the diurnal motion of the earth, what new or quasi-novel departure has ever been attempted, that these progress-fearers have not dissented from and denounced.

34. But I confess that I should no more have expected you, a true friend of progress, and a thorough Liberal, to require any demonstration of the first proposition (*viz.*, that after a certain period of their existence all Despotic Governments become injurious) than to require this in regard to the rising and setting of the sun. In both cases we have the whole life-long experience of all thinking men and the entire history of the globe to attest the fact, and putting aside an infinitesimal fraction of perversely-minded men like Froude, you will not find, I think, any man of any intellectual capacity in Europe or America who will contest this very harmless proposition. As to when that certain period did or will arrive in each concrete instance, wide differences of opinion will exist, but that sooner or later it must occur will, I believe, be almost as universally admitted as that sooner or later death must overtake every living being.

35. The second proposition, *viz.*, that the time has now arrived when the despotic form of our administration has become in many respects injurious to this country, is of course quite open to argument, though I can hardly understand any true Liberal like yourself questioning the fact.

Starting from first principles we may lay down as broad general rules (subject to certain exceptions, which however do not affect our present case, and requiring many minor riders to make them universally true)—

1st.—That the educated natives of any country, whose whole lives are passed in that country, whose whole interests are centered, and whose entire property is situated there, will know more of the wants of that country and its people, will understand better how to provide for those wants, and will be more interested, earnest and persevering in making that provision, than educated foreigners who only come to that country as visitors for a term of years, whose most vital interests are centered in a distant realm, where also the bulk of their property is situated, and, *à fortiori*, than such foreigners if their knowledge of the language, customs, habits of thought and generally of the genius of the people of that country happens to be extremely imperfect, and most of them devoid of any real or close sympathy with that people.

2nd.—That there is wisdom in a multitude of Councillors, and that, in the long run, for the general purposes of every-day administration, the decisions arrived at as the results of full and free discussion, by large bodies of men fully conversant with all the circumstances, will be sounder than those arrived at, after mere consultations *in camera*, by a few men, imperfectly acquainted with those circumstances.

3rd.—That the broader the basis of any Government, *i.e.*, the larger the proportion of the educated or intelligent men amongst the governed that directly or indirectly take part in it, the more stable it will be.

36. Now our despotism in India has arrived at a period when, despite there being tens of thousands of thoroughly informed natives of the country available to assist in this work, it practically confines the discrimination of and provision for the wants of the country and people to (as regards the matters in question) imperfectly informed foreigners; when, despite there being huge numbers of non-officials of all races, thoroughly conversant with the practical working amongst the people of the internal administration, it practically leaves all decisions in regard to this entirely in the hands of tiny groups of officials, who are most imperfectly acquainted with these practical results, and when, despite the existence of the great bodies of thinking and educated men referred to, it imperils the stability of the Government by practically excluding them, almost absolutely, therefrom. I could write fifty pages showing in detail, branch by branch, and department by department, how the present despotic

bureaucratic system is retarding progress, and entailing hardships on the people ; but I submit that even in the brief abstract form in which I have put it I have sufficiently shown that our despotism has now arrived at a time when it has become injurious to the best interests of India. I distinctly refuse to consider whether the continuance of this injury to India, and her people, may or may not bring any counterbalancing advantages to Great Britain and *her* people. *I* hold it impossible that, in the long run, it should do so ; but I simply decline even to consider the question, because I hold it, and I know you do also, as an axiom (in regard to which I will no more listen to an argument than I would as to the preferability of *vice* to *virtue*) that the sole justification of our presence in India is the good of India and her people.

37. The third proposition is that, in consequence of the already too prolonged continuance of a despotic form of Government, misrule, to a serious extent, and much suffering prevail, and, after what I have already said in the immediately preceding and previous paragraphs, this calls for no further exposition. It is open to you, or to any one, to deny what I have stated in regard to the lamentably frequent miscarriage of justice, especially in criminal matters, the oppression of the police, the irksomeness to the people of our revenue systems, the extreme poverty of enormous numbers of them, &c., but it is the simple truth, and all who know the ways of the people of this land will admit that, although you are a far greater man and much cleverer and wiser than I am, I am in a far better position to learn the truth and far more likely to be right, in this matter, than yourself. And I claim not only not to exaggerate, but to say a great deal less than I might. If I chose to write an Indian Uncle Tom's cabin, I could awaken a storm of indignation in England, not far inferior to that which Mrs. Stowe's work elicited in America. Mr. Zabberdust was a man whom your father would have gladly turned out of the service, and his doings in this case were exactly as stated. I could produce a score of cases involving equal injustice and oppression, though of a different nature, with High Court comments on them, and that despite the incredible difficulty that exists of bringing home misdeeds to district officials. A single case like this (or like that of the officer who recently cruelly flogged 40 men and boys before breakfast for what the High Court declared was absolutely no offence), successfully worked up to the High Court and thus secured the reprobation it merits, indicates at least twenty similar ones, of which neither the general public nor the Government ever hear anything ; but I have never dwelt on such cases, because I know that, even though many of our modern officers are out of touch

with their people, are unsympathetic, and only intelligently mechanical in their dealings with these, it is only a comparatively very small minority who are wilfully oppressive and wicked, and to give any great prominence to *their* doings, would be to convey as unfair a general picture of our officers as Uncle Tom's Cabin did of the slaveholders as a body.

38. The last proposition is that the maladministration and suffering that results from the want of adjustment to their environment of our judicial, police and fiscal systems can only be remedied and relieved by the gradual and progressive introduction, *not*, as *you* phrase it, of representative Government, *but* of a Representative element into the Government. Truly after what I have said this last proposition seems to me not only to require no separate demonstration, but to follow as a necessary corollary. We have for fifty years been doing our best. You and I are both agreed on this point; but none the less, in many matters of internal administration, facts all over the country stare us in the face, defying us to deny that we have made a terrible mess of the business. We are the cleverest people on the face of the earth—at least we think so—and even our bitterest detractors will not deny us a large modicum of brains and capacity for and willingness to work; and yet we have failed, and failed lamentably, and, to me at least, it appears simply and *palpably*, because, with all other qualifications, we yet lack that supreme one of being ourselves one in mind and heart with the people whose affairs we have sought to regulate; because we are ignorant to a great extent of those affairs and wholly so of the manners in which it would best suit and please them to have these transacted; because, in a word, we are foreigners, and despite our most ardent aspirations to do right, are unable to achieve this in these, as it were, domestic matters, without the guidance and the fullest co-operation of the people of the country themselves, and this we *can* only secure by the method indicated in this last proposition.

39. The greater portion of your 14th para. has already been replied to, but when you say that I must have seen in the newspapers that these pamphlets have incurred the severest censures from a variety of native pens, I must remind you that if in three or four newspapers (whose character is so well known that no one out of a certain small ring fence heeds in the smallest degree what they say) I *have* seen possibly a score of such attacks *professedly* by native pens, I have, in ten times as many newspapers, seen endorsements, of all the pamphlets contain, by many hundred times as many *unquestionably* native pens. I do not, myself, attach much importance to either set of facts, but if any argument is to be deduced from them that argument

would unquestionably be favourable and not adverse to the pamphlets. Again when you say that, "feeling as strongly "as I do the extreme unwisdom of writing and circulating among "ignorant and excitable people, foreign to us in blood and differ- "ing in religion, such accusations as these against the present "Government in India, I am unable to agree that native gentle- "men who profess to share the same view are necessarily actuated "by feelings other than my own," I must remind you that the classes to whom these pamphlets are addressed, the classes which they can alone reach, *viz.*, first the English-educated classes ; secondly, the various classes of tradesmen and shop-keepers ; thirdly, the well-to-do ryots, and in, possibly, five places in India, artizans, are not ignorant in any true sense of the word, and so far from being excitable are probably the most un-excitable and law-abiding people on the face of the earth—that differences in blood and religion have really nothing to do with the question since it is the system and not the individual, as is distinctly declared, to which objection is taken, and systems, like corporations, have neither physically nor spiritually—that our accusations, as *you* call them—guarded admissions of such facts as it was impossible to blink, as *I* call them—are at any rate not one-half so bitter as those which for many years now *all* these people have been, amongst themselves, every-where and at all times, bringing against our Government, *and that coupled with these admissions, is information as to how by loyal and constitutional means the evils complained of may be mitigated.* It is all the difference of your stand-point. You *think* that all these people who have not had an English education are a dull, ignorant lot, quite satisfied with the Government, and, thinking this, of course you say it is a shameful thing to go and awaken discontent and preach to people about grievances which they have not recognized, and these pamphlets are abominable. But the *facts* are that these people are very sharp and intelligent in their own Oriental way, and that, while quite admitting how good are many of our arrangements, they are intensely *dissatisfied* with Government in regard to all those matters on which we touch, and so far from adding fuel to fire, we so put things as to make them look on the whole hopeful, and give the people a legitimate aim and a channel for the discharge of their dissatisfaction. It all comes to this. *You* still *believe* that the shoe is a very decent fit ; but the whole country *knows* that it is *not ;* and when you say that you cannot see why native gentlemen may not share your views, our reply is, because every really intelligent native gentleman knows too well how the case stands, and because it is impossible for any really enlightened and honest native gentleman, who

mixes personally with the lower-middle and upper-lower classes, and knows what they have to put up with, specially in the way of criminal (in?) justice and police, and what they have been saying amongst themselves for the last ten years, to deny that the Congress is doing a good work both for the country and for British rule. I reiterate, though you bring this up against me sarcastically, all I have ever said about our desire to promote harmony and good-will amongst all classes, but I must ask you to consider whether if we have spikes in our shoes which grievously prick those beneath us, that good will is more likely to be promoted by blinking these unpleasant facts, or by truthfully drawing attention to them and indicating an orderly method of securing their removal? Nay I would ask you to consider whether any real good can ever come out of anything short of the simple truth dispassionately told. This I claim for the pamphlets; and certainly they set down naught in malice, though I *cannot* assert that they in naught extenuate. But by this time, with your roseate views, you will have set me down as a hopeless pessimist. I regret this and it is a mistake, for, if I see the evil, I see much that is good and have large hopes of better things to come; but bear in mind at least—and it is a truth of which time will convince you—that in those matters in which my views now seem to you pessimistic, these latter are shared by ninety-nine out of every hundred Indians capable of reasoning correctly on what they see and hear, though fully half of them may lack the moral courage to confess their convictions, and a small percentage may be found unconcientious enough to deny them point blank.

40. In para. 15 you tell me that another seriously objectionable method of the Congress is that of identifying itself with the majority of the people of India, and assuming that it has a right to speak in the name of that majority. But my dear friend how can we do otherwise consistently with truth? It was quite true that at the time of the last elections not above ten per cent. of the adult males of the population knew anything about the Congress, but the perfect touch in which we were, through this fraction, with the rest of the population, enabled us to be certain that the general views expressed by the Congress were those of nine-tenths at least of the intelligent members of the entire community. We have never denied that there are some 12 millions of adult males, representing a population of about fifty millions, who are utterly incapable of thinking about or comprehending such things, who mentally and morally are very little above the level of our cattle; but no reasonable man would dream of including such in the people of India that has to be represented. The members for

Yorkshire, though they represent the county, are not supposed to represent its horses, and neither do we, who represent this country, profess to represent its cattle, be they human or bovine.

41. Your reference to the appeal to the British Nation signed by the Presidents of the three Congresses, Messrs. W. C. Bonnerjee, Dadabhai Naraoji and Budrudin Tyabjee (though *published* in London by our accredited Representative there) is incorrect. It nowhere purports to *come from* 200,000,000 of people; it merely states that such and such *are* the grievances of that vast population, and that all classes of the people of this country have met in Representative Congresses, year by year, for the last three years, and have formulated their needs; every word of which is strictly true. The appeal lies before me now, and you have only to reperuse it to see that you were mistaken. And in entire accordance with this was Mr. Bradlaugh's explanation to the people of Northampton, that when he called Messrs. Dadabhai, Norton, Bonnerjee, &c., representatives of India, he did not mean that all the people had elected them. Even in England, where a regular electoral system existed, and had existed for centuries out of a population of some 60 thousand, only some 4 thousand had actually voted for him, and yet no one would question that he represented Northampton. So far as I have seen no word has been said or written in England or elsewhere by either Mr. Dadabhai or any other of our representatives, at variance with the fact that, so far as could be ascertained at the time of the last elections, not above ten per cent. of the population, then, knew anything about the *Congress*, though this does not mean that these others knew nothing of the grievances which the Congress is seeking to redress. Of course it cannot be said *now* that not more than ten per cent. of the population know anything about the Congress. At the *lowest* estimate, at this present moment, fully one fifth of the 38 or 40 million intelligent adult males, comprised in the population of India, know a good deal about the Congress and, save an inappreciable fraction, are favourable to it.

42. You say you do not understand what is meant by indirect and passive support. If the elders of a village talking over the matter on the *chopal* decide that one of their number shall go in and attend a meeting at which delegates are to be elected, then we say that those elders, and the people who follow their guidance in the village, indirectly support the movement. If at any meeting of a *beraderi*, or guild or caste, one or two of those present say: "Brothers, we are going in next week to the "Sudder and we shall attend the Congress meeting there to elect "delegates;" and the others say: "Well, the Congress is a good

"thing, we have no objection,"—then we reckon such *beraderi* or guild, &c., as passive supporters.

43. You object to the expression "the pretended defec-"tion of the Musulman community from this national move-"ment." I should use this expression at this present moment with even greater confidence. Wait and see! Large measures take time, in this country, to mature, but I have every reason to believe that in a not remote future we shall be able to furnish unimpeachable statistics proving, what we know now to be the fact, *viz.*, that out of about eight millions of intelligent adult male Mahomedans, fully one-eighth are already in favour of the Congress and not even one per cent. are in any way, really, opposed to it.

44. In your 16th para. you say: "Of the unmeasured "and often scurrilous language of some of the Congress news-"papers, I will say nothing, for I see that you yourself, in your "speech at Allahabad, deprecate it." Of course I *do* deprecate and condemn it in the strongest terms, and so does every man of any sort of mark or influence connected with the movement. But what may I ask do you mean by "the Congress newspapers." Omitting Government Gazettes and the Madras district papers, which are edited by the Collectors, out of 371 newspapers and periodicals of sorts, of which we have a knowledge, 309, including papers like the *Madras Mail* and the *Bombay Gazette*, are distinctly Pro-Congress. If out of this vast number there are some that degrade our noble cause by foolish or improper utterances, is it any matter for astonishment? I see a good deal of unmeasured and scurrilous language in some of the London papers, even in those Society papers that constitute the literary pabulum of the very cream of English Society, and if you really expect our Press here to be exempt from blemishes conspicuous in a considerable and important section of the London Press, you must surely think that our people are altogether superior to the London people, which is hardly reconcileable with your contention as to their ignorance and illiterateness. But, moreover, if some members of that large majority of the Press that supports the Congress are scurrilous and ill-conditioned, we must remember that the example was first set them by the Anti-Congress Papers. In all India *The Englishman*, *The Pioneer* and *The Civil and Military Gazette* are the most scurrilous and ill-conditioned, though the *Lucknow Express* (nominally the organ of the Taluqdars, really that of certain Anti-Congress officials), and one or two others run them pretty close. And while I join with you heart and soul in condemning the scurrilous writings of certain native Pro-Congress papers, and these are few in number and mostly conducted by

semi-educated men of no social position, I should have liked to see you even more ready to condemn the scurrilous writings of those English newspapers conducted by men who by position and education are, and in the conduct of their papers ought to be, gentlemen, and who by their evil example have led astray some of the weaker members of our flock. Could not you now preach a little abstinence from scurrility to the *Pioneer*, for instance, with which you have great influence, and which a short time ago dubbed Munshi Newal Kishore, a glib oleaginous Baboo, because he happened to be a native, though it now sings his praises because he poses as an Anti-Congressist? Could not you advise the *Lucknow Express*, nominally the organ of those native gentlemen whom you believe to share your views as to the state of the country, not to circulate infamous slanders as they do, *e.g.*, when the other day they said that Mr. Bhimjee was paid Rs. 10 a day by the Hindus to go about the country and lecture on the Congress, when every mortal man knows that the Hindus do not pay Bhimjee a farthing, and that he gave up a good appointment, and took up the cause solely for the love of the thing and because, as he said, having worked all his life only for himself and his family, he wished before he died to do something for his country also? It is all right extracting the moats from our eyes—it will do us good; but do not you think you might sometimes take a turn at operating for the beams in those of our opponents?

45. I entirely agree with you that the passage which you quote from the preface might just as well have been omitted. But in almost all you say about it you are under a mistake. In the first place, it is quite incorrect to say—"your own preface." I am the General Secretary, it is my duty to draft all important papers, but my relation to the Committee is precisely that of a Secretary to the Government of India, to the Viceroy and Council. If I write a pamphlet, like the Conversation, I am personally responsible for every word, and as I write, so the text issues; but if I draft any letter, preface or manifesto for the Committee, my responsibility there ceases, and the draft by no means always issues in the shape in which it was drawn. I dwell upon this because Europeans, who do not know how many much abler men than myself help to guide the Congress movement, fancy that I am its Alpha and Omega, instead of being merely, as I am, an humble though zealous member of a large party.

46. Having set you right on this general point, and having, notwithstanding in the case of this particular sentence, accepted the primary responsibility, let me repeat that I entirely agree with you that it sins against our first principles;

indeed some English friends have taken the same objection to it. At the same time, we being mortals do not pretend that we can in every small particular always act strictly up to our principles. Can you? And we must plead that if not very charitable it was at least true. For to borrow your rather kakophuistic language, the man who *after* Messrs. Dadabhai and Tyabjee's explanations could presist in saying that our Political Congress ought to be also a Social Congress, *must* of necessity *be* either a fool or a knave. It is an abuse of terms to talk of difference of opinion in this case, just as much as it would be in the case of a man who declared black was white. It is not a question of opinion, it is a naked fact. For you will observe that the people we are speaking of are not those alluded to at the end of your 16th para., of whom more anon, who put forward, according to you, views which *may* be treated as matters of opinion, but only of those persons who, after the utterly irreconcileable nature of the two works had been clearly demonstrated to them, could yet presist in finding fault because both were not combined in one undertaking. Of course you are quite right, and we will all try and profit by your just rebuke; the charitable way of dealing with knaves and fools is not to force them, poor things, to blush, by calling them by their right names, but rather to smile pityingly and pass on. But then, you know, persistent knaves, at times, and persistent fools, very often, become so irritating that the wisest of us at last get cross and fall away somewhat from our philosophic ideal. *Humanum est errare nemo mortalium semper, &c.*—but I entirely agree with you—the passage you refer to was not up to our standard of charity, and it had better have been omitted.

47. But you are in error in quoting the three fundamental objects of the National Party, as indicating what the *Congress* ought to aim at. For the Congress is only one of many national movements, set on foot by that party, and, as the page you quote from explicitly sets forth, the Congress was designed only to carry out one branch of the second of their objects, *viz*, regeneration along the political line. The text is quite clear on this point, and I cannot understand how you fell into this mistake. Nor are the other branches neglected; besides those that have arisen independently, more than two hundred schools and associations, of one kind and another, for promoting mental, moral and social progress, owe their origin to the same impulse that gave birth to the Congress movement, and in all of these you will find the prime movers, if not taking *also* an active part in the Congress movement, at any rate strongly in its favour. And this brings me to what you say at the close of your 16th para., that certain social reformers urge as objections

to the Congress movement. But who *are* these critics? Europeans who are only reformers *of other people*, and on paper. There is not a single real native reformer of any light or learning, whether a labourer on the mental, moral or social line, who has ever put forward any such preposterous argument; because, in the first place, all know that since the Congress started, the activity along all these lines has been infinitely multiplied, and because, although the Congress does not directly deal with social and moral questions, it indirectly assists the solution of all the most difficult problems involved, with an ever-increasing force, by breaking down the barriers of local and provincial prejudices, by widening the scope of men's vision, and by gathering together and facilitating the freest *consultation* amongst a large majority of those most interested in these questions. For the educated men of India are not blind, and they know well that to conquer for their country the position at which they aim, they must advance (taking the intelligent portion of their countrymen with them) pretty well *pari passu* along the whole line and the men who are the most interested in the political regeneration of India are, with few exceptions, those who are most earnestly labouring for its regeneration along the other lines also. Here, as elsewhere, it is simply that the real facts have been withheld from you or you would be with us entirely.

48. In your 17th para. you again make a mistake; you say that I compared the Congress to the infant Hercules. Pardon me, I compared it to the handful of leaven hid in many bushels of meal; all I said about the infant Hercules was that you could no more expect from our Congress at the present day the great work at which it ultimately aims than you could have looked for from Hercules in his infancy, those mighty deeds which glorified his manhood. But your intuition has not failed you; our Congress, though in its infancy, *is* destined to be a Hercules, and true to its prototype, it now, in its infancy, aims only at reforming the internal administration, the nation's domestic affairs, though doubtless, as the years roll on, and the reformed and expanded Legislatures it contends for, broaden into Parliaments, it will, in its maturity, cleanse and thoroughly purge the Augean stable of our foreign policy. But why need you or I trouble ourselves about things that can no more possibly concern *us* than the next transit of Venus?

49. I need not follow you in your 18th para.; nothing can be more moderate or kindly than your discussion of our methods. Considering how little of the real state of the country and its people, in these particular matters, seems to be known to you, I wonder that you do not speak far more strongly than

you do, and I fully appreciate your reticence. I have no possible doubt, however, that as you grow to know more of the truth you will find yourself more and more in agreement, not only with our methods, but our measures, and that some day, if you live, you will say, "after all they were very nearly right. I did not "understand how far things had gone."

50. In your 19th para. you say that you are in doubts as to what the Congress scheme, for the reform and expansion of the Councils, really is, because the Resolutions say one thing and a passage in Mr. Viraraghava's Catechism seems to say something else! Surely, you are joking! The Cobden Club prints and circulates a vast number of books and pamphlets bearing on free trade; do you suppose that either the Club, or the free trade party, is responsible for or in any way endorses every passage in each of these publications? Of course not; the publishing committee merely goes through the work and satisfies itself that in its main lines the book is in accordance with free trade principles and publishes it. Each author is responsible for his own work. So it is with our committees; they satisfy themselves that pamphlets and leaflets submitted to them accord generally with the principles of the Congress movement, and that is all. For all details the individual author is responsible. When the last Report was compiled this Catechism and the Conversation were the only pamphlets in circulation and that is why they were reproduced, as *specimens*, not because the Congress party endorsed every word in them. Now, they may be reckoned by the score; almost every circle has its own pamphlets, leaflets and speeches, many of them never submitted to committees, but published on their own account by volunteers, but for all opinions expressed and facts stated in each and all of these, the individual authors and orators are responsible; and if you ever find anything in any of them at variance with the Resolutions of the Congress, you may rest perfectly satisfied that it is these latter, and not the opinions put forth by individual authors, that express the mature views of the Congress party; in other words—if you will not be *too* indignant—of the nation. To me, until I found that you too had doubts on the subject, it *did* seem "absurd nonsense" for any one to suppose that any opinion expressed by any individual writer could possibly have any weight or value in determining the aims and objects of a party, in face of the formal and explicit declarations of what these are by that entire party's accredited representatives in Congress assembled. You might as well, it seemed to me, get hold of Hansard, and selecting the speech of some individual member, declare that you were uncertain what the House of Commons really meant,

because, though the House had passed a formal Resolution on a certain subject, you found a passage in a speech of a member, reported in the House's own proceedings, that certainly said something quite different. However, if *you* could share this supposition, the expression "absurd nonsense" was inappropriate, and I withdraw it, and will only say that this supposition involves the most remarkable misapprehension that I have ever met with.

51. Nor is this the only misapprehension that comes upon me in this portion of your letter as a surprise. In this same 19th para. you go on to say: "A really Representative "Council, in the present state of India, would include, you will "have foreseen, very few of the class who crowd the Congress "benches." My, possibly, limited foresight, I am bound to say, does not permit me to arrive at any such conclusion. We have had artizans, cultivators, intermediate tenure-holders, small and great land-holders, noblemen, shop-keepers, traders, money-lenders, bankers, merchants, manufacturers, lawyers (in every branch of the profession), engineers, doctors, missionaries, educationalists of all grades, literary men, newspaper editors, men earning their daily bread by the sweat of their brows, millionaires, men belonging to every province and every important district, to every creed and every nationality (except the Jewish) in India, at our Congresses, and these men, the most intelligent and enlightened of the classes and creeds which they represented; and truly your contention that very few of these men would find places in a really representative Council appears incomprehensible. But let us understand each other. Do you consider the English House of Commons a really representative council? I do not say, mind, a theoretically perfect representative assembly, but, in your own words, a really representative council. If you do not, *cadet quæstio*, for we do not pretend to go beyond our teachers, and, perfect or imperfect, real or unreal, we shall be perfectly satisfied if we *ever* get as near an approximation to "a really re- "presentative council" as Great Britain now possesses. But if you admit that the House of Commons is a really representative council, then I must point out that all your arguments against the Madras Congress having been also a really representative council are untenable. Analysing Debrett's House of Commons for 1888, by the help of the brief biography of each member therein given, I find that not 2-5th, as at Madras, but fully 2-3rds of the members belong to that "small section of men," that "fragment of the English people," that "owes its existence" to high education and culture, and though these gentlemen have succeeded "by energy and by manipulation of the neces- "sary methods in entering" the House, I doubt whether there

are 50 intelligent Englishmen who would agree with you in thinking that they thus "occupy a false position." To say of these gentlemen, or of our Madras men, that "they can, at the "most, claim to represent their own views," is, to say the least, to occupy a position, never yet, to the best of my belief, occupied by any other intelligent Englishman. "Represent their "own views"? Very likely, but unless these views are those of the majority of their constituents they will very soon cease to represent anything. Of course, as in England, the people here, *as a rule*, elect and will elect to represent them, the men that they think, on the whole, most likely to do them credit, or the men that they most like or look up to, and here, as in England, a large proportion of those elected will always be highly educated men. True our electoral system is only in its infancy, and yet it is not even now so very despicable. This year fully two and a half millions of adult males will have taken an actual part in the elections. From some divisions and provinces from which the reports have come in, the figures would indicate a far greater number, but other provinces, like your own in particular, are so backward that, though the number may exceed two and a half millions, I will only take it as this. Let us turn to the English list and see how the case stands, and it will be sufficient to take the first two boroughs and counties on the list, for Aberdeen, with its ancient University, is politically and educationally quite on a par with the best boroughs and counties in Great Britain.

Name of Borough or County.	Population.	Estimated adult males.	Registered electors.	Voted at the last election.
Aberdeen North ...	55,893	13,973	8,383	5,865
„ South ...	49,110	12,277	7,885	6,003
Aberdeenshire E. ...	83,295	20,824	12,522	7,496
„ W. ...	66,834	16,708	10,500	5,511
	255,132	63,782	39,290	24,875

So in this most favoured locality only 63 per cent. of the registered electors and less than ten per cent. of the population took a direct part in the elections. But if you turn to the published analysis for the whole of Great Britain, which, however, I cannot verify, less than half* of the registered electors and less than 8 per cent. of the total population voted at the last general elections. Now looking to the relative condition of the two countries, it is quite certain that even if the English system obtained here, *mutatis mutandis*, the franchise being lowered with reference to the generally lower standard of means, we should not, at the outside, have above 20 millions of registered voters, and of these I believe that nearly, if not quite, one-eighth will this year directly join in the election of representatives—that is, about one-fourth the proportion in Great Britain. It is true that our voters will be only about 1¼ per cent. of the population against, at any rate, less than 10 per cent. in the British Islands, but the far smaller proportion of highly educated men in India, most of whom become everywhere centres of political activity, fully explains this. But while in these respects Great Britain will advance little, our figures will improve rapidly year by year, and, as it is, I confess I am unable to see on what possible grounds you can allege that the Madras Congress was not just as *really* (though not as *perfectly*) representative of the people of India, as the House of Commons is of the people of Great Britain.

52. Again, when you say that if representation be adjusted to numbers, "numerically they (the highly educated classes) "will be nowhere," I think you fall into a double error. In the first place, the Congress has always advocated the English system, which adjusts representation quite as much by intelligence and property as by numbers, and has always repudiated the idea of mere manhood suffrage. In the second place, even *if* manhood suffrage obtained, the ryots everywhere (broadly speaking, of course there would be exceptions), and they constitute an immense majority of the population, would elect their favourite pleaders; and so would a considerable proportion of the zemindars and traders. The fact is that the greatest number of well-educated, ready, self-possessed, and independent men are to be found amongst our lawyers, and in any Indian House of Commons this class would be found to hold a considerable proportion of the seats, just as they did last year at Madras, and just as they do now in the House of Commons. But it occurs to me that you may possibly mean that, *if the Government had the selection of the Representatives*, members

* It seems difficult to believe this, but these are the figures that I cut out of an English paper just after the close of the last general elections.

belonging to the highly educated classes, our best men in fact, would be numerically nowhere ; and if so, I am in no position to contest the fact ; you yourself, a Governor, ought to know best about *this*. But, I submit, that it is only by an abuse of language that a people can be said to be represented by a set of men arbitrarily selected by a close bureaucracy, and that whenever any *real* system of representation is introduced into India, the bulk of the Representatives here, as in England will always be drawn from the more highly educated classes, be these classes themselves, numerically, (in proportion to the total population), weak or strong. The empire of mind is indestructible, and though clouds may at times, here or there, obscure their rays, sooner shall the sun cease to give light by day and the moon by night, than the more highly educated cease to be chosen as leaders and representatives by their less enlightened brethren.

53. You go on to say that the business of the more highly educated classes " at present seems to " you " to be to seek " to communicate to their countrymen, the enlightenment " which they themselves have received, more than to attempt to " represent in the councils either themselves or those to whom " enlightenment has not hitherto been vouchsafed." You, " think, " in a word, they would if " you " might dare to advise them, be " more usefully employed in educating the people than in edu- " cating the authorities." This is kindly put, but yet I must reply that your alternatives are not, as you seem to fancy, mutually exclusive, and that on the contrary it is their duty BOTH to seek to communicate their enlightenment to their less advanced countrymen *and* to represent these in councils, where at present, practically, nothing is understood of their real position, BOTH to educate the people *and* to *try* (the hardest task of all it would seem) to educate the authorities. And at all this, with their whole minds and hearts, they are working.

54. There is enlightenment of many kinds—mental, moral, political (in the broadest sense of the word). Everywhere throughout the country schools and colleges are springing up or being resuscitated, founded or revived, by our Indian friends: I can truly say that not a week passes without some one writing to me about some new educational institution, of one kind or another, that he or he and his friends, have just started or are about to start. Day by day the party labouring specially for the moral and religious regeneration of the country grows in size and in earnestness, though here, as in England, this party will always be in a minority, since to be a real member of this party involves, not merely the sacrifice of time and money,

but the reduction of preachings to practice, a purity of personal life, a conquest over human passions, prejudices and frivolities to which comparatively few—few in any country, in any age—are, or have been equal. All this is the work of those more enlightened classes to which you refer. But what then? All men cannot be schoolmasters, still less moral or religious instructors. There remains, what to every citizen of a free state (and you won't contend that we are *quite* slaves, will you?) there remains, I say, what to every free citizen is as important a branch of enlightenment as any (not a few would contend that it is *the* most important branch), *viz.*, enlightenment, as to his duties and rights *as* a citizen. At this branch too our educated classes are labouring earnestly. At this moment, there are not less than 500 men, belonging to these classes, who are doing their utmost to communicate directly by word of mouth their enlightenment on these points to their less advanced brethren. Hundreds of thousands (I believe I ought to say millions*) of pamphlets, speeches, tracts, leaflets are in circulation, to say nothing of what fully 100 newspapers (all edited by this same highly educated class, I omit the others) are weekly, tri-weekly, or daily setting forth, and not one day passes but what in one part or other of the country meetings, often several on the same day, with audiences of from 100 to 5,000 men are held, at which these matters are explained and discussed.

I doubt if it be possible, in practice, for any set of men to do more along all these three lines than our educated classes are doing at this moment, and independent of this incredible multitude of isolated efforts, they have organized as a synthesis of the entire national energy, THE CONGRESS MOVEMENT, which, while only designed directly for the diffusion of enlightenment on the one line, by the interest it evokes, by the discussions it gives rise to, by the teachings it conveys, by the lessons it inculcates of self-control and self-sacrifice, of subordination of self to others, of personal interests to those of the nation, and in a hundred other ways, really operates with almost equal effect along the lines of mental and moral development, and constitutes, as a whole, I believe, an instrument for the national regeneration along *all* lines, unparalleled in the history of the world.

55. But when we come to the education of the authorities it must, I fear, be confessed that our people have not done as much as seems to be required. The fact is that, while we recognized that a certain section of the European officials

* Of my own Allahabad speech alone in several languages, the printing of over 150,000 copies has been reported to me.

were (owing to class and race bias, limitation of grasp, and general want of adjustment to their Indian environment) incapable of realizing the real position of affairs, the great bulk of our foremost men assumed, almost as an axiom, that all the Europeans of light and leading (though they might not think it politic or becoming their official position to speak plainly about it) in their hearts understood and regretted the shortcomings of our administration and the feelings these were engendering, as thoroughly as they did themselves, and hence, unhesitatingly, looked to all such as our necessary and certain, though, in consequence of their position, passive allies and sympathizers. Yet here are you, one, "foremost in the ranks of time," one, whose decision on any serious political question, if only you had all the facts fully before you, nine out of ten men, would prefer to their own; a judicial-minded man, full too, I believe, of liberal instincts, writing me a letter absolutely irreconcileable with these characteristics, except on the assumptions —that you really do not *know* that our internal administration is grievously defective, that justice, especially in criminal cases, is hardly procurable, that the police are a curse to the country, that taxation is impinging on the necessaries of life, that one-fifth at least of the whole population are never more than half-fed and are often quite half-starving, and that in many other ways our people are suffering—that you do not *know* the feelings that, despite all we have done for them in other matters, these shortcomings have engendered in every intelligent mind throughout the population, nor the manner in which, for the last ten years, this latter has been giving expression to these feelings in every hamlet even—that finally you do not know how marvellously wide the grasp is that the Congress movement has already obtained on the minds of the people of India. If you do not know these things, and if you did know them, *you* could not have written this letter, as it would then be disingenuous—if you do not know these things, as your letter, it being yours, seems to prove that you do *not*—then there is not a village in the Empire, many of whose ryots could not teach you a great deal upon these subjects. I can understand second rate officials, such as I myself was, remaining blinded to the real state of the case, by that fatal official glamour that, in the East, so envelopes all in authority, but that a man like yourself, with your vast experience here and in Egypt, should still be lapped in such Utopian and roseate delusions, is past my comprehension.

56. One only explanation presents itself. You may say, "I *do* know these things though I consider that you somewhat "overstate them, but I think it inexpedient to speak about

"them, and I deny entirely that our administration is responsible "for them.

> "How few the ills that men endure,
> "That kings or laws can cause or cure!

"They exist, not as a consequence, but, in spite of our "administration, they are of the nature of dispensations of "Providence, and no changes in the form of the administration, "such as you contend for, will diminish these evils. Are there no "poor in London? No miscarriages of justice in England?"

If this *be* your position and this is reconcileable, to a certain extent, with your letter, I wish you had said so plainly, as it would greatly have simplified my task, but my reply would be, I think, none the less conclusive. There are miscarriages of justice in England, but even allowing for the difference in the size of the two populations, not one to one hundred that occur here. There is an enormous body of paupers in London, but taking the British Isles as a whole, and even ignoring the fact of the increased difficulties entailed by a cold climate, our paupers are proportionally four times as numerous, and even in England a great deal of this lesser proportion of poverty is due to errors in administration, and bad laws, which the people are beginning to find out and will gradually amend. It is true that our worst sufferings, the result of sin and sorrow, sickness and death, and our own moral shortcomings are to a great extent beyond the power of kings or laws to cure; but those sufferings which result from unsuitable and *insufficiently controlled* judicial tribunals, from an under-paid, unprincipled, oppressive and practically almost irresponsible police, from excessive taxation and unsound fiscal systems, are just those ills which kings and laws can and do to a great extent cause and cure. I wholly deny that all that the people now suffer is "not in consequence, but in spite of our adminis- "tration," and I and the whole Congress party affirm that as soon as a really strong and truly representative native element is associated in every branch and grade of the administration from the Executive Council of the Governor-General downwards, half at least of these sufferings will gradually disappear. But even admitting that we are wrong, none the less do the people universally attribute these classes of their sufferings to our maladministration and *not* to the decrees of Providence, and none the less does the future peaceful continuance of British rule depend upon our, at least, shifting the apparent responsibility for these evils from our own shoulders on to those of the people themselves. Whether therefore the results will or will not be as beneficial as we maintain, the only wise and safe thing for the British Government

to do is to accept what the ablest, most educated and most enlightened amongst the natives themselves, believe to be the right thing to do in these matters—in other words to accept the more liberal and less bureaucratic policy indicated by our Congresses.

57. The rest of your 19th para. seems, after what I have already said, to demand no lengthened or further discussion by me. It is founded, it appears to me, on a series of misapprehensions. We deny that the demand for representation, whatever it did originally, before the practical bearings of this reform were understood, *now* comes from any small or peculiar section of the people, and as to that class "created by Government," to which you refer, for every one of this special class that urges this demand, many hundreds belonging to other classes *now* equally press it. So far from representative institutions being alien to the genius of the nation, they had, as far as we can see, their origin in India, they underlie the whole social structure of indigenous society, and are universally understood. The foreign policy of the Government of India *may* be beyond the comprehension of our most advanced men—I am sure that it is altogether beyond mine—but there is no single question of internal administration that our best men are not as well qualified to deal with as any English officials; nay, in my opinion, in consequence of their necessary want of what we may stretching the term sum up as local knowledge, the latter for such work are inferior to the former. Lastly, though it may flatter our national self-conceit to swagger about being a far more advanced people, this is only partially true. Our superiority lies chiefly in the advances we have made in physical science, but this is not quite everything. In this respect the Indians are by no means as backward as the ancient Greeks, and these latter, despite their crass ignorance of our modern deity, physical science, still stand out, after the lapse of 2,000 years, as a wiser and nobler people, in many respects than ourselves. A larger proportion of our English population has no doubt received a high education, and gorging ourselves on flesh as we do, we have more of the bull dog in us, and that is about all we can say to justify our grand assumptions of superiority. As for the average ryot all over the country he is certainly as good and intelligent a man as the average farm labourer in England or Ireland and knows quite as much, though in different lines; and the same may be said of the average Indian petty shop-keepers and traders, who represent our English hawkers and stall-keepers. Despite our old wicked Abkari system (in *your* Government, now doubtless purged of many of its former iniquities, but such is not the

case everywhere) the Indian people are far more sober, chaste, industrious and forbearing than are the people of England, and the Indian proportion of law breakers is much smaller; and this convenient British plea for all our high-handed and despotic procedure that "this people are *in statu pupillari*" to me, seems as ludicrous as it is impertinent. It is true that we having, partly by force and partly by fraud, shattered their administrations, disorganized their institutions, trampled out some of their best customs (*e.g.*, the friendly settlement by arbitration in every village and caste of all differences *inter se*), and generally shunted them, without their consent, on to a wholly new and to them strange line, they still need and will need for long our aid, advice and support in completing the grand transformation scene that we have inaugurated, but this is no earthly justification for persisting, as our bureaucracy does, in continuing to treat tens of thousands of men, not unfrequently far better men on the whole than themselves, as if they were still children "*in statu pupillari*." Indeed, there are very few of us who, in many matters, might not profitably go to school under our Indian brethren.

58. Your 20th para. again is also based to a certain extent on a misapprehension. You say that you turn to the Resolutions in order to get a clearer view of the wrongs and grievances of the people, and this is the right thing to do, but you fail to realize what these Resolutions really involve. You talk of the extension of the legislative councils, perhaps overlooking that the mere extension is a small matter, and that the essential point in this Resolution is the infusion into the administration of a strong representative element which shall possess a potential voice in the direction of internal affairs. It is a grievous wrong no doubt to those people of this country who are thoroughly qualified to participate in the management of their own affairs, that they are still "like dumb driven "cattle," taxed without representation, and the hard gained earnings extorted from them, expended without their having any voice in the matter. But this is not the only wrong or grievance at which this Resolution aims; the improvement of the judicial system, especially where criminal cases are concerned, the reform of the police, the modification of our revenue systems, the larger employment of statutory natives of India in every branch of the executive—all these and much more are necessarily involved in this Resolution. It is hopeless recording Resolutions on these matters of internal maladministration, (though now and then, in plain concrete cases, such as the separation of judicial and executive functions, it is done) because it is felt that, as a rule, the British Government

has done its best, that unaided by native counsels and co-operation it cannot do much better, and that the only chance is to get the people themselves to work at the reform of the internal administration; and for all this, this first Resolution provides.

59. Moreover, your comments on some points touched on in this same para. are, I regret to say, as foreign to the general tone of your letter as was the passage you justly took objection to in our preface to that general rule of charity towards opponents which we endeavour to observe. You say: "If a Representative Council is to be established to abolish the "Arms Act, replacing by legislation, in the hands of the people "weapons of which the unrestricted use under former dynasties "has grievously mutilated the roll of Indian annals, and in "our own times traced the bitterest and most bloody chapter "in our Anglo-Indian history, &c."

This is only worthy of the *Pioneer;* it is unworthy of *you*, because, though you may not fully realize the state of the country, you *can* read the Resolutions and the debates that led up to these, and *have* done so, you say, carefully, and therefore ought to have known when you wrote this eloquent, but utterly fallacious passage, that the Resolution only proposed the modification and *not* the abolition of the Arms Act, that speaker after speaker explained that the unrestricted use of arms was not desired, was greatly to be deprecated, and that the Resolution itself proposed that the Government should retain the power of debarring all persons, classes, or communities that it considered unfit to be trusted with arms, from their use. Moreover, and this seems to me even less defensible, you talk of the general use of arms, as having traced the bitterest and most bloody chapter in our Anglo-Indian history; in other words, as having caused the mutiny, when you know well, not only that it had nothing to do with the mutiny, not only that this was purely a mercenary military outbreak, not only that the great mass of the people who then bore arms were with us, aided us, befriended and saved our isolated fugitives, but that it was solely the then universal habit of wearing arms (keeping alive as it did the martial spirit of the people) that (in those dark hours of danger and distress, when despite British genius and British pluck all seemed lost) saved our Empire and enabled us to re-conquer Upper India. It was not our 50,000, later 70,000, British troops that, despite their heroism, wrought this miracle, as, at the time, it seemed; it was the aid and support that the country (outside our military mutineers and their immediate friends and a section of the Mahomedans) gave us; it was the 250,000

Indians still full of martial instincts, because still permitted to bear arms, who flocked to our standards, that enabled us to regain our position and restore our rule. Had the people not been with us, and had the Punjab, Oudh and the North-Western Provinces then been, as now, debarred for thirty years from the use of arms, Upper India, at any rate, would have been lost to us for good. And yet, in face of the facts that the mutiny was a military outbreak, that the bulk of the population was with us, and that our triumph was due mainly to the fact that that population was still armed and hence martial, you have not hesitated in true Anglo-Indian and *Pioneer* style to attribute "the bitterest and most bloody chapter in our history" to the very circumstance that proved our salvation.

60. I need not follow you in your congratulations of the Government on its legal exploits ; I have already explained that *all* these codes are by no means so highly estimated by the country as by those who created them, and while admitting that some of them, like the Penal Code, are in many respects worthy of high commendation, I must remind you that paper work is not everything, and that the people might well be far more happy and contented, under far inferior codes, better administered in practice. Nor need I answer further your remarks about the separation of the executive and judicial functions, or native volunteering, for if you do not realize the frequent miscarriage of justice that now results from the union of these two functions, or the intense dissatisfaction that these miscarriages are generating, or again the grievous danger alike to the country and our Empire that this crushing out of the martial spirit of the people (which by a system of volunteering we seek to avert) is creating—if history teaches you no lessons, and in what for instance befel the disarmed Britons when the Romans withdrew from their country, as we shall some day withdraw from this, you can discern no warning against our present policy in these matters—it seems useless to continue a discussion when our standpoints are so absolutely different.

61. But in reference to the opening passage of your 21st para. allow me to remind you, first, that the Congress party puts forward no claim of the nature you refer to, and, secondly, that if it did make *any* claim it would simply be to have popularized and methodically formulated, more or less vague pre-existing ideas, and to have brought these within the sphere of practical politics. Let me point out to you further that that party does not speak "on behalf of millions it has had no opportunity "of consulting and who have given it no warrant whatsoever," but on behalf of those millions that it has consulted and

whose foremost men everywhere have elected its members. You seem to ignore the fact that the people elect the Sub-Committees, the Sub-Committees and the people of the head-quarters, the Committees, all these Committees and the local representatives and the people of the head-quarters, the Delegates, and that all these Delegates belong ex-officio to the Provincial Standing Congress Committees. In your own provinces, thanks to the strenuous and unconstitutional opposition of certain of the officials, who have been the prime movers and main supporters of the so-called Anti-Congress Party, *without whose efforts this would never have been heard of*, the organization is defective to a degree, but you must please not judge India by these backward and unhappily circumstanced provinces. So it follows that the Resolutions of the Congress do not, as you suppose, represent the views "of a class, and that a minute and "exceptional" one, but embody those of, broadly speaking, the entire intelligence and culture of India. How far the Congress party has "overspread its natural borders" time will show, but though I know that, recently, you expressed doubts as to the propriety of re-forming the councils at the present time on the ground that this would be to invest the Congress movement with an importance it did not deserve, I am hopeful that the British Government, as a whole, will not share the autocratic sentiment which leads men to refuse to do justice rather than appear to have yielded this to the prayers of the oppressed, and will not find in the claims of the people to what have become, as free British citizens, their rights, any bar to the concession of these.

62. And now, to close this lengthy epistle, let me say with you that "I have expressed myself in this letter, as I "think you would wish me to do, with the perfect freedom which "your letter invited, and also, I trust, with the perfect fairness which "the tone of your letter" (barring that one passage about the arms question) "requires of me," and "I look to your indul-"gence not to class me with those" whose "aggressive tone may "rather hinder than assist the Government when the hour for ac-"tion may seem to it to have come." If I have been compelled to differ from you, and even traverse your statements, it has been solely because the true facts of the case have not hitherto been laid before you, though I am rejoiced to see that you *do* recognize that there is a class, "who are no less opposed to the "Congress than disaffected to English rule," for it is this class that constitute the sole reality in that great sham, the Anti-Congress Party, and it is this class into whose hands, believing them to be their own instruments, our official antagonists (really the tools of these traitors) are so unwisely playing. Believe me

that so far from promoting the aims of those rebels, the Wahabi supporters of the Hindustani fanatics, the favourers of Duleep Sing and of Russia, (whom we are watching even more closely than the Punjab authorities, though they are ever on the alert), it is just because these all recognize that the Congress movement means their checkmate, that they are exerting themselves so frantically to obstruct that movement at any cost.

63. *Au reste*, though I have been compelled to set forth what I believe to be the truth as to the present position of affairs in India, and have thus necessarily traversed some of your leading statements, I should be indeed ungrateful if I did not realize and acknowledge the courtesy and the fairness (your knowledge of the facts being what it is) which characterize your letter; if I did not prominently avow that I believe you, and always have believed you, from the bottom of my heart, utterly "incapable of persecuting any man who differs from you "in opinion;" nay from first to last I have pressed upon all friends, and specially in Lucknow that the officials who under colour of giving effect to your wishes, have been practically persecuting the Congress party, were mistaken in your character; and if I did not acknowledge that all you say about the necessity of moderation and non-aggressiveness (so far as truth admits) in our statements, is wise, kindly and deserving all our attention, with these sole provisos, that battles cannot be all rose-water and kisses, and that if your adversaries, however inferior they may be in numbers and character, not only persist in hitting hard, but also in hitting below the belt, you must, just sometimes, in self-defence, let them too have it straight from the shoulder.

Yours very sincerely,

A. O. HUME.

PREFATORY NOTE.

In view of the unworthy and mischievous efforts that continue to be made both in India and in England, to cast odium on the Congress and misrepresent its aims, and of the countenance recently given to these efforts by the *Times*, it has been suggested to us that the series of articles on the subject by the late Mr. Robert Knight which first appeared in the *Statesman* some years ago and have lately been republished in that journal, might with advantage be produced in pamphlet form, with a view to their more extended circulation in both countries. Originating in the desire to set before the Indian people true ideas of Representative Government, it is not claimed for them that they contain a cut-and-dried Parliamentary Constitution; but they embody suggestions based upon a wide examination of historical precedents, which will, it is hoped, be found worthy of consideration. It is of the utmost importance that the legitimate efforts of the people of India to secure for themselves a reasonable measure of representation should be wisely directed. For the political dawn that is now lightening over India, and that receives such striking illustration in the enthusiasm with which the annual assembling of these National Congresses is regarded by all classes of the people, is but a reflex of what has happened before in other lands, and been carried to a triumphant issue under wise and healthful direction. The same will happen with India. Reform must come. And it is in the earnest desire, begotten of a genuine sympathy with the people in their aims, that when it does come, it shall be of a real and substantial character, and not the delusive representation that is made the pretext for ignoring their just claims and aspirations, that the suggestions herein contained have been put forward.

THE EDITOR.

"Statesman & Friend of India" Office,
Calcutta, December 31st, 1897.

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS.

By ROBERT KNIGHT.

I.

It is a stale and unworthy device, and one to which no honourable opponent will stoop, to attempt to discredit a great political movement, by misrepresenting its true nature. It is not our purpose to provoke controversy, but simply to protest against the parody of the Congress which declares it to be aimed at the subversion of our rule and the substitution of a Native Parliament of Indian peasants in its room. As a fact, nothing is more noticeable in the Congress movement than the sobriety of the counsels by which it has been marked throughout. Its leaders discern as clearly as their opponents, the extravagance of such views as those which are ascribed to them, only to discredit their aspirations and aims in the eyes of our own countrymen. There is a short and easy method of dealing with such opponents, and as its statement will afford a clue to the considerations which awaken our own sympathy with the movement, and we believe we may add with truth, the sympathy of every reflecting and just mind, we shall state what it is.

We take it then for granted that there is a consensus amongst educated men of the present day that no system of government, let its merits be otherwise what they may, can be a wise and healthful government which excludes the people themselves from all share in its labours and responsibilities. Most Englishmen are sick of the exposition which modern history has furnished of the evils of what is called "centralisation of authority." So continuous and so clear has become the proof that the exclusion of any civilised people from a just share in the responsibilities of government

is fatal to all progress amongst them of a lasting order, that students of history, and educated Englishmen most of all, profess to hold this belief unwaveringly. The great conflict between the unhappy Charles I. and the Long Parliament may be regarded as the commencement of the modern era of governmental institutions. The Revolution of 1688 was but a renewal of the same conflict, the theatre of which for nearly a century was now transferred to America, to culminate in the great war in which the States asserted and finally achieved their Independence. So settled and so universal has become the conviction that the colonists waged a just and righteous war against the English Crown, that it has long been the fashion to speak of the success of the Americans in that conflict as the birth of human freedom. We are entitled to assume that the opponents of the Indian Congress

ment also have no doubt whatever that the colonists
t nerica represented the cause of human freedom, and
their war against ourselves was a just and righteous
in the success of which the whole human race was
ested. If they do not think so, they belong to a very
minority indeed, whose sympathies lag strangely
d their intellectual abilities. There is little doubt,
ver, that we should be doing these gentlemen a wrong
posing them to hold views on the American War of
endence of so retrograde an order, while the fact that
sympathy must be real and not affected, makes it
t or of the greatest surprise to us that they should
h old it so completely in India from a "cause" which in all essential respects is identical with the cause for the maintenance of which the colonists dared and endured the sufferings of the great and protracted war out of which they finally came as victors in the interests of human freedom and wise government everywhere.

Now, then, comes the point. We are all admirers, or professed admirers, of the stern endurance and great achievements of the colonists. We hold their cause to have been sacred, and the English claims upon them to have been such as to justify their rebellion, their resort to arms, and the

throwing off of the English allegiance. And yet we do not hesitate to say that not one Englishman out of five hundred in these days knows what it was for which the colonists finally fought. As a fact, they were the freest people on the face of the earth when their great leaders, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, and Washington, determined that the apparently trifling claims the mother-country upon them involved principles, the admission of which would prove fatal to the continuance of the political freedom for which their fathers had exiled themselves from their own country, to seek in the forests and prairies of the New World the civil and religious freedom denied them in the Old. We believe it will surprise many of our readers to learn how unique and remarkable was the freedom enjoyed generally in the States from their very formation as Colonies. Take as an illustration the liberties enjoyed by Connecticut under the Charter granted them by Charles II., liberties which they had held in full possession for nearly a hundred years before the famous Declaration of Independence in 1776. To begin with, they were allowed to *elect all their own officers*, from the Governor downwards; to administer justice by judges elected or appointed by themselves, and without appeal to England. Their Penal Code was decreed by themselves, while they had power to inflict punishments, to confer pardons. In a word, they exercised every power of an Independent State, both deliberative and active. The King did not even require that the laws passed by them in their freely-elected Assemblies should be transmitted to England for his inspection. "Connecticut," says the great American historian, "was independent except in name." And what was the result of this happy freedom under complete self-government? It is impossible for us to describe it here. "Happiness enjoyed unconsciously," says the same historian; and no more bright or beautiful picture of human society could be drawn than the faithful pourtrayal of the general condition of the States when their Elders wisely and deliberately resolved to sacrifice all, rather than yield to the demand that the Parliament of England, or its King, should impose

taxation upon them without their consent, or that the restrictions imposed upon their industry and commerce by the former, in the interests of British merchants, should continue.

Contrast now this condition of things in America before the War of Independence, which our statesmen and historians glory in as exemplifying the determination of the Anglo-Saxon race to govern themselves, with the state of things today in India, where, after a hundred-and-thirty years of our rule, it is declared by men of light and leading to be almost treasonous or rebellious that the leaders of the people whom we have ourselves educated in the aspirations and convictions of free-men should assemble and take counsel together for petitioning the English Crown to introduce the principle of self-government amongst them in its simplest and most reasonable form. We admire the Americans who had enjoyed all the rights of free-men and had governed themselves successfully, for rising in rebellion against any interference in their concerns; while we can apparently afford no sympathy whatever for the classes in India whom we have ourselves educated to love and aspire to freedom and self-government, as though they were debarred by nature from ever sharing these blessings in common with ourselves.

II.

One of the most common devices by which the natural aspirations of the people for a share in the management of their own affairs is discredited, is the ascription to them of claims which they do not cherish, but which are put forth by writers of whom we are entitled to expect better things. Such writers apparently think that they have fairly described the aspirations of the National Congress when they tell us that its claim is to transfer the Government of this country from the Crown, and to vest it in a Native Parliament to be elected by the people of India themselves. That the Congress entertains no such wild idea we need hardly insist. The device of misrepresenting what the views of our opponent

really are, that we may throw a shadow of discredit over their true nature, is somewhat stale. No honest adversary ever resorts to it. An honest opponent makes it his first care when attempting to influence the public mind on any great issue that affects the public well-being, to be quite sure that he understands exactly what the issue is, and then to state it with the most scrupulous care, lest he should inadvertently awaken mere prejudice and uninformed hostility to a movement on the success or failure of which the welfare of the people in the future may be absolutely dependent. Some would have the world understand that the comparatively feeble assemblies of men who attend these Congresses as delegates from all the Provinces of India, are a mere body of ambitious agitators, whose real aspirations are not what they themselves avow them to be, but that they are a class who conceal a treasonable and wild idea of subverting British rule in India, in order that they may govern it themselves under a mockery of representative institutions embodied in a great Native Parliament, which they take great pains to show must inevitably consist of an assemblage of uneducated peasants elected under universal suffrage. Those who hold this view must have read history to little purpose if they fail to grasp from modern historians the vital fact in this controversy, that real progress for any people under institutions which exclude them from self-government is impossible. The great lesson which the history of the last four centuries is burning into the minds of reflecting men of every nation, is the long and fiercely-denounced belief that no real progress —progress that will last and that will develop itself by the great laws of growth implanted in the nature of man—is possible in any country or amongst any people who live under institutions which exclude them from all voice in the direction of their own affairs. You can place nothing in its room. The highest education will not stand in its stead. While self-government is withheld from any people there can be no real or enduring progress in that people. What is ahead of them is conflict and revolution, unless they are a race paralyzed by their past history, and to whom hope is forbidden. The

history of the United States is an exhaustive and imperishable illustration of the truth embodied in these reflections. It is impossible for the most careless reader of the story not to be struck with the many-sided and overwhelming proof which it furnishes that the progress of nations, and of the human race itself, depends upon the enlistment of the people in the task of governing themselves. There can be no real progress in any nation under any circumstances, that is not brought about by the development of the self-governing instincts of its people. The test of healthful and wise government amongst any people is to be found here and nowhere else. Any system of government whatever, whose tendency is to repress the self-governing instinct which exists naturally in man, and in all races of men is a system under which no true national progress, we say, can ever be made, and all appearances to the contrary are but illusive and misleading. Healthful and lasting progress in the social, moral, and political character of any people can come only from the wise and careful removal of every political arrangement that hinders this progress from arising as naturally amongst the people governed as the tree grows in the forest, or as infancy develops into strong and wise manhood, by the careful cultivation of those powers of development that are implanted by Nature herself in the organisation of each. It has been the failure of past ages to discern this fact of man's nature, and the repressive systems of government that have grown up thereunder, that has not merely hindered the advancement of mankind, but that has been the cause of nearly all the political crimes of which history is the record, and of the confusion and strife that fill the civilised world with conflict, and that at the close of this nineteenth century have converted Europe into a vast encampment of soldiers who are prepared at any moment, at the word of command, to enter upon the bloody work of exterminating each other. These armed multitudes do not even know for what causes they are massed together for the destruction of the hosts opposed to them.

Never was there a more striking exemplification of this truth than in the early history of the State of Virginia, which

not only illustrates, in the words of the historian Bancroft, "the humane and ameliorating influences of popular free-"dom," but presents also "a picture of the confusion, dis-"content, and carnage which are the natural consequences of "selfish legislation and a retrograde movement in the cause "of popular liberty." Virginia, which, under the sovereignty of its own people, was marked by its mild and beneficent legislation and the advancement of all classes, became at once the theatre of discontent and rebellion, with the arraying of class against class in conflict for mastery in the State, to the loss of almost every blessing which the people had enjoyed. It was the freedom enjoyed by its self-governing municipalities that made the "Old Dominion" the leading State in America, and it was the overthrow of this simple government of the people by themselves or their representatives, and the setting up of the Colonial system of Goverment by officers of the Crown owing no allegiance to anyone but the English Monarch, that made the State a scene of violence and selfish misrule that endured nearly a century, but that underwent constant amelioration from the steadfast determination of the people to regain the liberties of which they had been deprived by the violent usurpation of the English Crown, in the attempt to rule them by the issue of Royal decrees in place of honest and enlightened legislation by the assemblies of the people themselves. If the East is ever to be regenerated, it can only be by the introduction of the same principle in their political institutions and arrangements. The introduction can be but gradual in the nature of things, and the attempt to hinder its accomplishment by misrepresenting and travestying the aspirations which the people cherish, is unworthy of any educated man.

III.

THE Congress needs no other justification than the truism that if the people of India are ever to enter upon a course of real progress, it can only be by their learning to govern themselves. There are few Englishmen who do not profess to regard the American War of Independence as introducing the era of

modern freedom into the Old World as well as the New. It is the belief of Conservatives themselves, as well as of the Liberal Party, that the war waged by the American Colonies against the attempt of the mother-country to rule them either by Royal prerogative or by a Parliament in which the Colonies had no representation, was a just war, or, to use an expression of the venerable Franklin himself, a war "in the interests of humanity." Few Englishmen, we believe, even of those who are regarded as well-informed persons, have any exact knowledge of the causes which finally produced that great conflict. A vague impression exists that it was the attempt of Parliament to tax the colonists without consulting them, and without their own consent, that brought about the war. That this was the immediate provocation is true. Taxation without representation the Colonies declared to be tyranny, and a violation of their constitutional rights as subjects of the English Crown. The declaration was a concise and convenient formula for expressing the general nature of their claim, but was far from adequately embodying what those claims were. It will come as a surprise, we believe, upon many of our English readers when we say that the Colonies, or plantations as they were called, had from their very foundation asserted, and in many cases successfully maintained, rights which had been lost to the English people, if they ever existed, and which seemed to the nation generally, inconsistent with their allegiance to the English Crown and their duties as English subjects. It was this belief that made the nation, as a whole, justify and approve the war, and blinded it to the force of those simple and, as we now see, necessary demands which the colonists had with more or less consistency and persistence maintained against every attempt to regulate their affairs by Royal edicts or by Parliamentary legislation. A persistent and natural effort was made throughout the first hundred and fifty years of their existence (1575—1725) to govern them by decrees embodied in the Royal Charters under which they were founded. The attempt was resisted with equal pertinacity, and it was not until the Law officers of the Crown, including Lord Mansfield, about the middle of the

last century (1749), declared the Royal prerogative to be inoperative in the Colonies, that the attempt was finally abandoned, and the doctrine laid down by them that the Colonies were subject to the legislation of the English Parliament. For nearly twenty-four years before that time the imbecile Duke of Newcastle, virtual Minister for British America, was attempting to rule it by Royal prerogative, in defiance of the infant States and their local Assemblies. Having the patronage of a continent at his disposal, his long administration was a profligate attempt to provide for his connections in the aristocratic families of England — the old Whig aristocracy which despotically misruled the nation from the Revolution of 1688 down to its fall, with Pitt's accession to office. Where consummate discretion and ability were required, from the simple but noble character of the people to be ruled, the Royal prerogative was prostituted by being entrusted to men of broken fortunes, too dissolute, ignorant, and vile to be employed nearer home, so that America became, in the words of its great historian, "the hospital of Great Britain "for its decayed members of Parliament and abandoned "courtiers."

The colonists were not men to submit to rule of this order, and the personal character of the Governors who were sent to administer their affairs as representatives of the Crown, was one of the strongest of the provocations they received to declare themselves independent of the Crown altogether. As a fact, they had become practically independent before the War of Independence broke out, and were administering their own affairs under a system of local self-government that was attended by signal and extraordinary success. In several of the States, the colonists had long successfully asserted the right to elect their own Governors and the Members of his Council. Local Assemblies elected by the free suffrages of the people met once a year to vote their own budget. It was these Assemblies who determined the annual expenditure of the State and voted the salary of every executive officer therein, from the Governor down to the parish constable. In the same way the Judges were elected and their emoluments fixed. The

provision made for executive and judicial functionaries alike was determined by an annual vote, the Assemblies refusing to provide a fixed or permanent salary for any official whomsoever, thus keeping alive a sense of their responsibility to the people who appointed and paid them.

The New England States — Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island— were recognised as divided into little territories, each of which constituted a separate local Government free from supervision, and, for all *internal* purposes of government, self-contained and administered. The complete development of these strikingly successful institutions was to be found in the little State of Connecticut. Each township in the State was a territorial parish administering its own affairs, and in all these New England States, the towns annually chose their own officers, the townsmen holding meetings for the settlement of their concerns as freely as they pleased. In these meetings, all subjects of public interest were freely discussed. Every able-bodied man in the township was enrolled in the militia, and always provided with arms ready for use. It was these meetings that elected and instructed their representatives to the State Assembly. They provided free schools for the education of the young, and so successful was the system, that, in the whole of New England, there could not be found a person unable to write and read. He that will understand, says the historian, "the political character of New England, must study the "constitution of its towns, its congregations, its schools, and "its militia." It was local self-government that was the parent of the whole; and never did any Ruler of India act more wisely, or with truer insight, than did Lord Ripon in his determination that the same principle should at all costs be introduced into this country.

It is idle to allege that the people of India differ so widely from the American colonists in their character, and in the antecedents from which they have sprung, that local self-government can never produce such results here as it produced in the American States. The reply is immediate and direct, and is furnished by the States themselves. For it would be

an error to suppose that the condition of things we have described was universal throughout the States. Full proof is furnished by their history of the fact that wherever the efforts were successful on the part of the mother-country to suppress civil freedom and self-government, the result was uniformly the same. The fact is of too great importance to be entered upon by us here, and we reserve it for future discussion. Suffice it to say that the whole history of the States is but a continuous and striking illustration of the fact that no people can make any solid or enduring progress, under any system of government which does not devolve upon them, more or less completely, the responsibility for their own advancement. In India, we have unwittingly and unfortunately set up what is perhaps the very worst form of government that the civilized world has yet seen. It has not been done wilfully, but has arisen out of circumstances unique in their character. The statement may startle such of our readers as have occupied themselves but little with political studies, but it is a fact that the system of government we have set up in India is the very worst form of government the civilised world has yet known. It has been done unconsciously, and in the teeth of the national wishes and desires, but is largely redeemed by two great and unique facts. It is no spirit of self-glorification that leads us to affirm confidently that it is the high character of the English people generally, and their innate love of fair play, that have so materially tempered the despotism of our rule, as fairly to entitle it to be called beneficent. The nation has honestly desired to rule India justly, and it has been the failure of the Bureaucracy to reflect this desire faithfully, under the influence of self-interest, that has marred its accomplishment. It exists widely in the ranks of the Bureaucracy itself, and the fact is as honorable thereto as it is illustrative of the strength of the national desire. But the time for reform has come, and while India will, we hope and believe, escape the sufferings and sacrifices by which the American colonists achieved their freedom, it is the primal duty of her educated sons— a duty to Englishmen as well as to themselves—that they should use

every means in their power to awaken their Rulers to the fact that no people can ever make solid or lasting progress under a system of government such as that which exists in India. The incalculable benefits that arise from local self-government must be secured by the people at all costs. They will have the sympathy of good and wise men in all countries on their side, and most of all amongst Englishmen. It is not revolution that the Congress asks for, but reform that is as urgently needed in our own interests as theirs. The thin end of the wedge has been already introduced, and with the spread of education in the country the worst evils of the present system will disappear of themselves.

The second fact in the system of our rule, the existence of which is at once a proof of the goodwill and integrity of its administration, is the concession to the people of complete freedom of speech. No step was more profoundly wise than the concession, by Sir Charles Metcalfe's brief administration, of a Free Press to the people. In this single boon alone, may India find the sure promise of her final redemption from all that is evil and demoralizing to her sons. If they but use this freedom with wise and settled purpose that it shall not be abused, but directed to its legitimate task of exposing what is evil both in the spirit and administration of our rule, it will achieve for them all their reasonable aspirations and claims.

IV.

We have remarked that no other justification is needed in the eyes of well-informed men for the annual assembly of these National Congresses in India than the consideration that all modern history bears witness to the fact that there can be no real or lasting progress amongst any people who are excluded from the right of self-government as we exclude the people of this country. The members of the Indian Civil Service enter upon the discharge of their responsibilities at so early a period of life, and as a rule find them so onerous, that they have little time for the study of history, even were they desirous of pursuing it; while they finally leave the country at the very time when the many are but acquiring the

broad and accurate knowledge that makes their retirement a calamity to the people whom it was their life-task to govern. There is no remedy, unfortunately, for this evil, or at all events none that has yet been discerned. It is a few civilians only whose tastes lead them to political studies, and the retiring civilian, as a rule, has profited so little by his Indian experience, that he finds himself upon his arrival at home in an atmosphere so foreign and so uncongenial to the views of the Government he has been administering all his life, that he is practically unfitted to take any active part in the conflicts which attend the freedom of political life in England. Service in India is, as a rule, unfriendly to broad and generous views of public policy, and of the part which every people *must* take in the management of their own affairs, if the evils which they suffer are ever to be remedied. The very benevolence of which the Indian Civil Service is conscious, is of itself a hindrance to every reform that is proposed. How is it possible, they say, that a people like that of India at this moment should manage its own affairs? They forget that the most important part of the education we can teach them lies in this very direction, and that it is as impossible to teach a boy to swim who is never permitted to go into the water, as to look for the capacity of self-government, or the development of that capacity, while we exclude them from its simplest forms. The Congress movement wants no apology in the eyes of those who reflect upon what the education of a people really means. As to any danger arising from the annual assembly of these meetings, we can discern none but what may be naturally developed from unwise attempts to interfere with them. We have but to show a just sympathy with the aspirations of the people to make them innocuous and wholly healthful—that is, if there is any truth in the teachings of history.

If the teachings of history are rightly interpreted by its great masters, there is no hope of real progress in any people who are excluded by their rulers, from all right of governing themselves. Where the governing class rigorously exclude the people, as has hitherto been the case in this country, from all real share in the administration of their own affairs, no

uprightness of intention on the part of those rulers can compensate for that exclusion ; no general benevolence of purpose towards the people, can do more for their lasting progress than set them upon the task of governing themselves. It is the striking illustration which the history of our English Colonies affords of this fact, that constitutes its chief value to the present age. The lesson taught to the nation by the American War of Independence failed to impress its governing classes as it was natural to believe it would, and it required the experience of another century to burn the lesson in upon the minds of Englishmen. We have had to learn it at heavy cost, but it is at last happily accomplished, and England has ceased to dispute with her Colonies upon the right of governing themselves. In all the large Colonies of the Crown and in some of its dependencies, we now permit the people to legislate for themselves, and have ceased to regard these possessions as so many preserves for the exercise of Ministerial patronage in providing lucrative offices for the scions of the English aristocracy. With the exception of the Governor himself, there is hardly an office or appointment in the Colonies which the Crown is permitted to fill. To all the larger Colonies and even to the great Dominion of Canada the Crown has wisely, after more or less conflict with their people, conceded the right of absolute self-government. And this vital right has everywhere been conceded, more or less freely, as the century has advanced, from the enlightened and growing conviction that no people can ever, in the long run, wisely and successfully administer the affairs of another to which they are necessarily strangers. Now, the greatest of our Anglo-Indian statesmen have, we think without exception, avowed the conviction that our rule of India can never be more than provisional, and that it would be unworthy of the English people to regard it as other than a necessary evil to be endured by India and justified in the eyes of the world, on the plain and honest ground that its people generally are not yet able to govern themselves. When Sir Charles Metcalfe gave the people the right of complete freedom of speech, as twenty years later when Sir Charles Wood laid a broad foundation for their higher educa-

tion, they both distinctly saw and recognised the inevitable results of these concessions. Both saw that the necessary result of their measures would be to teach the people to aspire after free institutions, and a share in the administration of their own affairs. It was the wise purpose of both to awaken these aspirations. They saw nothing honorable to ourselves as a nation, or attractive as a spectacle to other countries, in an attempt to govern India for all time by a foreign Bureaucracy resting in the last resort upon English bayonets. Their ambition was a nobler one. It was to impart to the people of India the knowledge which the Western nations have acquired only by centuries of conflict, prolonged to the present hour. Who upon reflection, would be willing to avow deliberately his hope that India with her great traditions, the mother of ancient civilisation, the land of the *Rishis*, and of the most profound and subtle speculations of the human mind, should permanently be subjected to a foreign rule that branded her children with a general and broad stamp of incapacity for all time to govern themselves? The voluntary assembling of these National Congresses discredits of itself the brand of incapacity which the thoughtless and selfish few of our countrymen are so ready to put upon the people. It is true that India is not able to govern herself, and equally true that the time seems to be still distant when she will be so, but these reflections in generous minds simply intensify the desire that the Government should steadfastly act upon the principle of extending local self-government of a real order as widely as possible in the country, for the education of the people in the practical work of administration. For ourselves, we confess that it is to the honest development of local self-government in the country that we chiefly look for the political education of its people.

We have been slow to express our belief that the attempt to secure a representation of India in Parliament, by getting two or three, or half-a-dozen native gentlemen elected thereto by English constituencies, is likely to prove not only disappointing, but mischievous. It is from a delusive representation of this order in Parliament, that Ireland suffered so deeply. In

spite of the hundred Members whom her constituencies send to the House, her representation therein was purely nominal until Mr. Parnell astutely made their presence felt, by his policy of obstruction, which so greatly embittered a large section of the House of Commons against the Irish Party. Men of broader views had begun to ask what policy was left to that party, when their votes on purely Irish affairs were systematically disregarded, or swamped, by the numerical strength of the English members. Should India be successful in getting half-a-dozen native gentlemen returned to the House, their influence, we reasonably fear, would be *nil*. Let them be as well-informed and as eloquent as they may, they would be hopelessly out-debated in an Assembly like the House of Commons, where no Ministry ever suffers itself to be defeated upon any important act of its administration. All that can healthfully be done in Parliament on behalf of India, is we believe to be accomplished by a more skilful and persistent use of the right of interpellation which its Members possess. In their long quarrel with the mother country, the American colonists carefully avoided the snare which was more than once laid for them, in the shape of the advice that they should demand for themselves actual representation in the House of Commons. They uniformly and wisely declined the counsel. They saw clearly, and pointed out, that their representation in the English Parliament could never be real, and would be used only as a pretext for reply to their declaration that "taxation without representation was tyranny." India should avoid the snare on the same grounds. The presence of any number of native gentlemen in the House, at all likely to be returned thereto, would serve only as a pretext for declaring that India was in the enjoyment of the same representative rights as the people of England. It is *here* in India, in the local Legislative Councils, that the Congress should claim representation, where it will be real, however ineffectual it may at first prove. It is to the development of local self-government throughout the country that the efforts of the Congress may be most wisely and effectively directed. It is in the towns and villages of India alone that the people can be

effectually trained and educated in the responsibilities and rights of free self-governing men.

V.

THE statement that we have unwittingly set up in India what perhaps is theoretically the worst form of government the civilised world has seen in modern days, may probably startle some of our readers who are impressed with what they honestly, and in certain aspects of it rightly, believe to be a government of the utmost beneficence. Think for a little, however, what the system is. In the first place it is a rule administered by foreigners, whose language, modes of thought, manners, customs, and traditions are all alien to the people. These rulers constitute in the second place, a close Bureaucracy who, from the circumstances of their appointment, necessarily regard themselves as under no obligations or responsibilities whatever to the people, beyond those which the law and their own sense of right and wrong impose upon them. Few of them find it possible to cultivate any sympathy or intimacy with the people, and as a rule their one desire, from the time they arrive in India, is to save as much money as they can during their service, and retire therefrom as early as is possible. If in the early years of their residence, they find much that is novel and attractive in their surroundings, it soon becomes monotonous, and the first long leave which they take to England makes them more and more impatient, on their return, to retire finally from the country and terminate their exile. It is but natural that this should be so, but when we remember that it is with these views and sentiments that they carry on what is still their life-task, it would be idle to shut our eyes to the fact that a rule of this order cannot in the nature of things be a healthful one.

But this is not all. Strange as it will seem by-and-by to the historian, he will have to record that, during the first 130 years of our rule, not one native of the country out of the 250 millions of people whom we govern, had ever been appointed to a place in the Executive Council.

He will have to record further, that from the Viceroy in Council downwards through the Governors of the lesser Presidencies and Provinces to the lowest officer in the land, the people were allowed no voice whatever in their appointment. The Governors, Councillors, and their Secretaries, with the Judges, were all appointed by the English Crown, and to such lengths was this exclusion of the people from all participation in the management of their own affairs carried, that, when after 130 years of this strange rule, the Viceroy, Lord Ripon, attempted to introduce an approach to local self-government in the towns and larger villages of the country, the proposal was received with a general outcry and protest that at all events they should not be permitted to elect one of themselves as their town, or village, president. The historian will have to tell our children that not only was the centralisation of authority in this foreign Executive so complete that strong opposition was raised even to the people appointing their own village officers, immemorially chosen by themselves, but that this centralisation of power within the country itself was intensified by the appointment of an officer at home who was called the Secretary of State for India, and who, with the assistance of a Council of old Anglo-Indians, was nominally supposed to be responsible to the nation for the just government of the country. He will point out that the two Councils became in course of time practically one, the Home Council approving, almost as a matter of course, whatever the Council in India thought fit to do; and that this unique and irresponsible double Government in both countries was conducted with closed doors, the correspondence between the two bodies being treated as confidential, the Secretary of State deciding even in the teeth of a Parliamentary demand for papers, what parts of his correspondence should be disclosed and what withheld. He will have finally to point out that the result of the system was that the Government was a pure despotism, owning responsibility to no one, and that its sole preservative from corruption and oppression of the worst order was the high character of the majority of the men

who were selected for service by the nation which appointed them. The remaining check was one unique in history, the importance and efficacy of which it was difficult to overrate. So nobly conscious, he will say, was the English people of its fitness to rule, and of the benevolence of its intentions towards India, that it boldly, and as the event showed, wisely, conferred upon the subject people the boon of a free press. The historian will dwell, we believe, with surprise upon this strange fact in the history of the governing power. India is the first example of a purely despotic Government challenging 'freedom of speech' upon all it does, or forbears doing. We are far too much interested in the experiment, and our point of vision too near, for it to be possible for any one at this stage of our history to discuss the influence of a Free Press upon the existing system of government, or to predict what results it will finally bring out in the near future. Combined with the equally bold resolution to give the people the advantage of the highest education attainable, at almost nominal cost, the institution of a Free Press takes the strange problem out of the range of past experience. The world has never before seen a great and powerful despotism administered side by side with a free press, and with the boon of an almost gratuitous University education for all who aspire thereto. It is a problem the conditions of which were never before imagined, and its solution cannot be anticipated. The system is meanwhile upheld by the presence of a large Army; but so peaceable and law-abiding are the people, that its services are almost wholly confined to the preservation of the country from invasion. We can well understand foreign tourists expatiating with admiration upon the apparent success of such a rule; but few of such travellers have the breadth of view, insight, or sympathy with the people of India to make their vague expressions of astonishment at what they see of any real value. The fact remains that the very beneficence of the Government, and its desire to do everything *for* the people and nothing *by* them, make our rule demoralising. If India is ever to rise in the scale of

nations and to make solid and enduring progress, it must be by the people developing capacities to rule themselves. What we *have* to do is to foster the growth of a great living organism, which is to arise, under our care, as a gigantic tree, shaping itself after the original design that lies latent in the living germ of its seed, and that must grow and develop itself under the vital impulses that reside within it and are the law of the organism itself. It is with this conviction full in our view that we have to legislate for India—if her people are ever to look back with gratitude upon the alien rule to which they were subjected.

VI.

In a former article we pointed out how our Colonies had avoided the snare to which Ireland fell victim at the Union, of a representation in the House of Commons, which they saw clearly could never be real, from the overwhelming majority of the members returned thereto by the constituencies of Great Britain. It is for reasons of this order that we do not attach much importance to the return of two or three or half-a-dozen native gentlemen to Parliament. Did they secure seats in the House of Commons, we should be told that the introduction of representative government into India in any form had become needless, since her people were already represented in Parliament. The American colonists, led by the strong insight of men like Franklin and Jefferson, saw clearly the snare that was laid for their feet. No representation that the American colonists could have secured in an English Parliament would ever have been anything but a sham. Our later Colonies have all followed in their foot-steps, and have successfully asserted their right to elect Assemblies of their own, for the control and administration of their own affairs. It is this right that the Irish people are now demanding, under what is called Home Rule; and it is to a representative government of this order that the educated natives of India must steadily look forward. That it is impossible at present, and will probably remain

so for a long time to come, it would be untruthful and purely mischievous to deny; but there are two directions in which the educated classes of India might confidently move at once. It was through municipal, or as we call it in India —local self-government—that the Colonies trained themselves for the wider sphere of the general administration of their own affairs; and it is through the development of local self-government in India, we believe, that the way will be opened for finally asserting an effective control over the general administration of affairs. It is want of candour only that can fail to see in the traditional village system of India, a true self-governing instinct existing in the people.

But there is one other practical step to which the attention of the Congress may well be directed. The American colonists declined every suggestion that they should be represented in Parliament; but they took a wiser step, and one that it seems to ourselves might well occupy the careful attention of the Congress. While politely declining all effort to obtain any representation in the House of Commons, they took the simple practical step of appointing Agents in London, who were real representatives of their circumstances and wants. Franklin himself was one of these Agents, and resided for many years in London as representative of Pennsylvania. The great Burke was Agent for some years, we believe, for the State of New York. It was the custom of these Agents to take counsel together in London, and, as they were accredited by the States which appointed them, they formed a valuable means of communicating closely with the Ministers of the day, on the wants and desires of the Colonies. Now it seems to us that this would be a wise practical example for the Presidencies and Provinces of India to imitate. Writers in the English Press who are opposed to all reform in India, have not failed to pour a good deal of ridicule upon the pretension, as they term it, of its political associations to be the representatives of the Indian *nation*. They say justly, that India consists of a congeries of nations differing from each other as widely as do the Continental

nations of Europe. Taking their cue from such journals as the *Pioneer*, they are never tired of expressing their contempt in particular for the claims of the Bengali Baboo to represent such races as those of the Punjab, Western India, and Madras. Wise men are careful to profit by the suggestions of their enemies, and we think it would be an important step in advance were the several Presidencies and Provinces of India each to appoint Resident Agents in London, properly accredited to the English Government, as the representatives of their circumstances, grievances, and desires. It would be necessary, of course, to pay these Agents properly, and to select them with the utmost care. They should be men in mature life, and of acknowledged status, gifted with tact and address, and, above all, intimately and exactly acquainted with the condition of the Province or Presidency which they represent. They need not necessarily and in all cases be natives of India, but might sometimes with advantage be Englishmen exactly acquainted with Indian affairs. If proper care were but taken in the selection of such Agents, and they were instructed to act in concert, their presence would soon be very sensibly felt in political circles at home. The various local Associations in India would find efficient representatives in these Agents, whose business it would be to receive communications from the Provinces they respectively represented, and to bring them promptly and clearly under the consideration of the India Office. By their means also, it would be possible to secure, without difficulty, constant and effective interpellation in the House, through its independent Members, who require only to be exactly informed, where now they are at the disadvantage of constantly being answered by plausible, if not absolutely untrue, replies from the Secretary or Under-Secretary for India. The successful establishment of but two or three such Agents in London, accredited to and recognised by the Government, would not be very costly; but it would be necessary that they should be properly paid, and that each of them should have an office at Westminster provided with every current record of their

province as a place of reference for information, not only for Parliament, but for everyone who wished to be exactly informed on Indian affairs. At this moment, there is no Province of India, nor any class whatever therein, that has an agent, or representative of its interests in England. Everything is left to the chance of some benevolent person or other having his attention casually awakened by something he may see in the papers, or hear spoken of in society. The late Major Evans Bell would have made an admirable Agent for the Native Princes of India, but in spite of his life-long efforts in their behalf, it did not occur to them to ask him to accept a formal appointment at their hands as their representative. Other gentlemen could be named, still with us, who would render invaluable service to any Presidency or Province that appointed them. The example of the great English Colonies in taking care to have their interests represented by properly constituted Agents in London, is well worth imitation.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

00029419

Digitized with financial assistance from

on 10 July, 2018